

## THE FEDERAL ROLE

It is impossible now to predict how far the Federal Government will go in the safety field. It is safe to say that nothing will be done that does not have overwhelming public support. I am sure that the public would rather have the States and local communities make and enforce the rules needed to protect those who use the highways.

The Federal Government can make a great contribution in the field of research and in disseminating information. The Federal Government can help by testing and evaluating safety devices for its own vehicles.

My bill is not intended to take away from the States the responsibility for licensing drivers and enforcing the laws to get incompetent and dangerous drivers off the highways. Its purpose is to get the States to accept their responsibility.

If we are going to cut down the highway death toll, teamwork is necessary. The Federal Government must continue to work with the States and local communities. But the States and local communities must realize that this is a national problem in which they have very definite responsibilities.

## ROCKEFELLER SUBMITS PROGRAM OF RECOMMENDED LEGISLATION

Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller of New York in his message to the legislature on January 3 said, in part:

"A vital factor in making New York State a better place to live is the impressive progress which has been made in the past 3 years in our approach to the basic factors involved in accident causation—the driver, the vehicle, and the highway.

"We are heartened that our record is the best in the State's history in that motor vehicle deaths have reached a new low in relation to miles traveled.

"However, we must continue our efforts to meet the traffic safety challenge. I urge:

"Legislation to subject all school bus drivers to chauffeur licensing requirements.

"Legislation to permit convictions of traffic violations in contiguous States as well as forfeitures of bail on traffic offenses to be included within the operation of the point system, and

"Consideration of appropriate standards for legislation to permit a broader program of driver reexamination."

## GOVERNOR REQUESTS 70 MORE TROOPERS IN WEST VIRGINIA

Addition of 70 men to the State police force in West Virginia was recommended by Gov. W. W. Barron in his address to the legislature on January 10.

The opening of new interstate mileage in the State adds to the need for traffic supervision, the Governor said. Due to the great distance between fuel and repair shops on these modern highways, the State police must render assistance to stranded motorists as a matter of both safety and courtesy, he added.

"Accident prevention itself is a basic police responsibility," the Governor continued. "The presence of State troopers on the highway prevents violations that lead to accidents. It also relieves congestion, and this increases the effectiveness of the State's overall traffic pattern.

"We are going to cut down the killing of our citizens on the highways—we must cut down this killing. This proposed legislation is one way in which we can do it without wasting any more time."

## SENATE

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 22, 1962

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

Rev. Wilbur E. Hammaker, D.D., bishop of the Methodist Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

O God, our help in ages past,  
Our hope for years to come;  
Our shelter from the stormy blast;  
Unto Thee we come.

On this anniversary day, like the Father of our Country, we look unto Thee as the hope of our land and of the whole, wide world. As he in his turbulent, troubled time leaned heavily on Thee, as the Almighty One, so we, in another hour beset by ominous and fearful potentials, feel our hope to be in Thee. Illumine our encircling darkness with the light of Thy countenance.

Grant unto us, as Thou didst unto George Washington, a sense of Thy imminent grace and goodness. Be for us a pillar of cloud by day, and of fire by night.

We are mindful of the way Thou hast guided our Nation in other times of turbulent uncertainties and potential disasters. Rejoicing in our strength and continuing worldly conquests of time and space, we beseech Thee to keep us aware that "Thou art the Ruler yet." Grant that we may ever, as individuals and as a nation, hold Thee in awe, and cherish Thine ancient sacrifice, an humble and a contrite heart. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, February 21, 1962, was dispensed with.

## MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its

reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8723) to amend the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act with respect to the method of enforcement and to provide certain additional sanctions, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. POWELL, Mr. ROOSEVELT, Mr. DENT, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, Mr. KEARNS, Mr. HIESTAND, and Mr. GOODELL were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

## ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 67. An act for the relief of Col. Samuel Hale;

S. 235. An act for the relief of Evagelos Mablekos;

S. 241. An act for the relief of Haralambos Agourakis;

S. 429. An act for the relief of Aic. Percy J. Trudeau;

S. 521. An act for the relief of Charles J. Utterback;

S. 531. An act for the relief of Eugenia Chrzastowski;

S. 1076. An act for the relief of Nancie Ellen Williamson;

S. 1348. An act for the relief of Sulzbach Construction Co.;

S. 1560. An act for the relief of Yasuko Otsu;

S. 1685. An act for the relief of Brigitte Marie Ida Kroll;

S. 1776. An act for the relief of Frances E. Sarcone;

S. 1791. An act for the relief of Dr. Tzy-cheng Peng;

S. 1832. An act for the relief of Susanne Rae Deremo;

S. 1866. An act for the relief of Dr. Berchmans Rioux;

S. 1870. An act for the relief of Lucia Bianca Cianto Rosa;

S. 2149. An act for the relief of Hugo Kolberg;

S. 2163. An act for the relief of Saifook Chan;

S. 2385. An act for the relief of Dr. Hau Cheong Kwaan, his wife, Tech Phaik Koui Kwaan, and their daughter, Laura Wai Man Kwaan;

H.R. 74. An act to reimburse the city of New York for expenditure of funds to rehabilitate slip 7 in the city of New York for use by the U.S. Army;

H.R. 258. An act to amend the District of Columbia Sales Tax Act to increase the rate of tax imposed on certain gross receipts, to amend the District of Columbia Motor Vehicle Parking Facility Act of 1942 to transfer certain parking fees and other moneys to the highway fund, and for other purposes;

H.R. 1375. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the former owner thereof;

H.R. 4934. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to modify certain leases entered into for the provision of recreation facilities in reservoir areas;

H.R. 8625. An act for the relief of Dennis H. O'Grady;

H.R. 8842. An act to amend subsection (h) of section 124 of the Agricultural Enabling Amendments Act of 1961; and

H.R. 9013. An act to provide for the transfer of rice acreage history where producer withdraws from the production of rice.

## ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the order respecting the reading of Washington's Farewell Address immediately after the approval of the Journal today, the Senate may now proceed to the transaction of legislative business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

## REPORT ON ANTENNA FOR ROSMAN, N.C., DATA ACQUISITION FACILITY

A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, on an antenna for the Rosman, N.C., Data Acquisition Facility; to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

#### REPORT OF ATTORNEY GENERAL ON COMPETITION IN THE SYNTHETIC RUBBER INDUSTRY

A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Attorney General on competition in the synthetic rubber industry, for the year 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

#### REPORT ON REVIEW OF VOLUNTARY AGREEMENTS AND PROGRAMS

A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Attorney General on review of voluntary agreements and programs, as of February 9, 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

#### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

##### By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Kentucky; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

##### "SENATE RESOLUTION 14

"Resolution relating to foreign spending

"Whereas it has become apparent that the United States has already spent over \$101 billion in foreign aid from mid-1945 until now; and

"Whereas our Government has given Communist dictator Marshal Tito, of Yugoslavia, \$2.4 billion, including \$700 million in military aid; and

"Whereas our Government has given Premier Nehru of India \$2.8 billion of aid, and they have been assured of an additional allocation in spite of his unwarranted attack on Portugal's Goa; and

"Whereas over \$900 million has already been given to Communist Poland with more to come; and

"Whereas over 600 million U.S. tax dollars has been wasted on Egypt's Nasser with no tangible results; and

"Whereas Communist Indonesia's Sukarno has received over 700 million American dollars and at the same time is threatening to grab property of one of our allies, the Netherlands;

"Whereas the known Soviet bridgehead, Ghana, in Africa, has been assured of a very large grant of U.S. dollars; and

"Whereas the United States will close our current fiscal year on June 30, 1962, with an estimated deficit for the current year of \$7.8 billion; and

"Whereas the United States after giving its riches over the years, now is having to turn to Western Europe for help in bolstering the hard-pressed U.S. dollar and in helping to meet some of the burdens of Western defense and of aid to the underdeveloped countries: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Kentucky:

"SECTION 1. That the Kentucky State Senate memorializes the Congress of the United States that all aid to Communist dominated, aligned, or controlled, countries, and specifically those set forth above, be stopped at once, and to remain stopped as long as they are identified in manner with any phase of the Communist doctrine, and that the moneys and aid that has heretofore been used for this purpose be spent in the distressed areas of our United States to raise their standard of living to the same level as the rest of the United States.

"Sec. 2. That the chief clerk of the senate forward a copy of this resolution to each member of the Kentucky delegation in the Congress and to the Chief Clerk of the U.S. Senate."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on Government Operations:

##### "HOUSE MEMORIAL 1

"Memorial petitioning the Congress of the United States of transfer of the present site and building of the Santa Fe post office, when it is declared surplus, to the State of New Mexico for the utilization of such site and building for a State museum

"Whereas the General Services Administration has announced plans to begin construction of a new post office and Federal building for the city of Santa Fe in the near future; and

"Whereas the present post office site and building located on Cathedral Place in Santa Fe, will be vacated upon completion of the new structure; and

"Whereas the architectural style and floor plan of the present Santa Fe post office building and its proximity to the historic Santa Fe plaza and palace of the Governors makes it admirably suited for a State anthropological museum; and

"Whereas the present facilities of the Museum of New Mexico are no longer capable of expansion to accommodate prehistoric Indian exhibits and other artifacts of an ethnological nature; and

"Whereas more than 200,000 American and foreign tourists, scholars, and students visit Santa Fe each year for the purpose of viewing and studying these antiquities of the West: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be respectfully petitioned to pass the necessary legislation permitting the transfer of the present site and building of the Santa Fe post office, upon its being declared surplus by the General Services Administration, to the State of New Mexico for utilization as a State anthropological museum; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this memorial be sent to the Honorable John F. Kennedy, President of the United States, the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, Vice President of the United States and President of the Senate, the Honorable John W. McCormack, Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Honorable Franklin D. Roosevelt, Administrator of General Services, the Honorable Dennis Chavez and the Honorable Clinton P. Anderson, U.S. Senators from New Mexico, and the Honorable Thomas G. Morris and the Honorable Joseph M. Montoya, U.S. Congressmen from New Mexico.

"JACK M. CAMPBELL,

"Speaker, House of Representatives.

"ALBERT ROMERO,

"Chief Clerk, House of Representatives."

A resolution adopted by the California State Board of Agriculture, Sacramento, Calif., relating to agriculture cooperatives and patronage dividends; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the Federation of Lithuanian-American Roman Catholic Societies, of Dayton, Ohio, urging the United Nations be directed to make demands that Lithuania and other captive nations of Eastern Europe be given the opportunity of reestablishing their own governments by means of free and unfettered elections; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Gainesville, Ga., opposing the creation of a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing; ordered to lie on the table.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, without amendment:

S.J. Res. 152. Joint resolution to provide for the reappointment of Dr. Caryl P. Haskins as

Citizen Regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution (Rept. No. 1210);

S.J. Res. 153. Joint resolution to provide for the reappointment of Dr. Crawford H. Greenwalt as Citizen Regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution (Rept. No. 1211);

S. Con. Res. 56. Concurrent resolution to print as a Senate document "A Report of U.S. Foreign Policy and Operations" (Rept. No. 1212);

S. Res. 290. Resolution to print, with additional copies, a pamphlet entitled "Commonwealth Parliamentary Association Meeting, London, England, 1961" (Rept. No. 1213);

S. Res. 295. Resolution to authorize a study by the Committee on Armed Services on strategic and critical stockpiling (Rept. No. 1214); and

S. Res. 297. Resolution to print copies of a hearing on export of strategic materials to Soviet-bloc countries (Rept. No. 1215).

By Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with an amendment:

S. Res. 293. Resolution to investigate problems created by flow of escapees and refugees from communistic tyranny (Rept. No. 1216).

By Mr. MANSFIELD, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, without amendment:

S. Res. 299. Resolution to print additional copies of the hearings on Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962.

By Mr. CURTIS, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with amendments:

S. Res. 298. Resolution to print a compilation of tributes to the Honorable CARL HAYDEN as a Senate document.

#### PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS ON REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 1 OF 1962

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, yesterday the distinguished senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], from the Committee on Government Operations, reported Senate Resolution 299, for the printing of additional copies of the hearings on Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962, and the resolution was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration. I have checked with the members of the committee, and they give their wholehearted approval to this resolution. Therefore, Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report the resolution, and I ask unanimous consent that the resolution may be considered at this time. The reason for this unusual request in this instance is that if the resolution is agreed to it will mean a great saving in the cost of the printing of the material the committee has in mind.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. METCALF in the chair). Is there objection to the request for the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 299) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Government Operations three thousand five hundred additional copies of the hearings on Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962.

#### PRINTING OF COMPILATION OF TRIBUTES TO SENATOR HAYDEN

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration

I report favorably, with amendments, Senate Resolution 298, and I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 298) to print a compilation of tributes to Hon. CARL HAYDEN as a Senate document, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with amendments, on page 1, in line 3, after the word "Senate", to insert "and the floor of the United States House of Representatives," and in line 6, after the word "that", to insert "fifteen thousand"; so as to make the resolution read:

*Resolved*, That there be printed as a Senate document a compilation of tributes, together with other related material, delivered on the floor of the United States Senate and the floor of the United States House of Representatives, to commemorate the occasion of the fiftieth year of congressional service of the Honorable CARL HAYDEN, of Arizona; and that fifteen thousand additional copies be printed for the use of the Joint Committee on Printing.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, the resolution is self-explanatory. Many Senators and also many Members of the House of Representatives have spoken on the life and works of Senator CARL HAYDEN. It is not my purpose at this time to add to those statements; but I point out that this is a historical event, not only in the life of Arizona, but also in the life of the Republic. I believe that by preserving in print his great record, we shall be rendering a service to the general public and to the youth that will follow. I am sure the resolution will be unanimously agreed to.

I may state, for the information of Senators, that the compilation of the remarks relating to the life and works of Senator HAYDEN will not be assembled for the Public Printer until about Wednesday of next week, so as to make possible the inclusion of any remarks made prior to that time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

#### SENATE MEMBERS OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING AND JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE LIBRARY

Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 300) providing for the appointment of Senate members of the Joint Committee on Printing and the Joint Committee on the Library.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 300) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That Mr. CURTIS be, and he is hereby, elected a member on the part of the

Senate of the Joint Committee on Printing, vice Mr. MILLER; that Mr. DIRKSEN be, and he is hereby, elected a member on the part of the Senate of the Joint Committee on the Library, vice Mr. KEATING; and that Mr. PEARSON be, and is hereby, elected a member on the part of the Senate of the Joint Committee on the Library, vice Mr. MILLER.

#### PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF SENATE REPORT NO. 448 ON "STUDY OF ADMINISTERED PRICES IN THE DRUG INDUSTRY" (S. REPT. NO. 1217)

Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 59) to print additional copies of Senate Report No. 448, 87th Congress, on "Study of Administered Prices in the Drug Industry," and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution, which was read, as follows:

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary two thousand additional copies of Senate Report Numbered 448, Eighty-seventh Congress, first session, entitled "Study of Administered Prices in the Drug Industry", a report issued by the Committee on the Judiciary and made by its Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly pursuant to S. Res. 52, Eighty-seventh Congress.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 59) was considered and agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement explaining the purposes of this measure.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows.

#### EXPLANATION

The Committee on Rules and Administration having considered an original concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 59) authorizing the printing for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary of 2,000 additional copies of Senate Report No. 448, 87th Congress, entitled "Study of Administered Prices in the Drug Industry," issued by the Committee on the Judiciary and made by its Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly pursuant to Senate Resolution 52, 87th Congress, reported favorably thereon and recommended that the concurrent resolution be agreed to by the Senate.

Senate Resolution 287, submitted by Mr. KEFAUVER on January 30, 1962, and the same day referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, would have authorized the printing of the additional copies as specified above. The printing cost estimate, however (\$1,780.61), exceeds the maximum permissible under a simple resolution. Since Senator KEFAUVER has assured the Committee on Rules and Administration of the subcommittee's need for the additional copies of the report, the Committee on Rules and Administration is reporting this concurrent resolution in lieu of Senate Resolution 287 to accomplish the desired purpose.

The printing cost estimate supplied by the Public Printer is as follows:

Back to press, first 1,000 copies—	\$1,494.28
1,000 additional copies at \$286.33 per thousand—	286.33

Total estimated cost, S. Res. 287—	1,780.61
------------------------------------	----------

A letter in support of Senate Resolution 287, addressed to Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, by Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, chairman of the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly of the Committee on the Judiciary, is as follows:

U.S. SENATE,  
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,  
SUBCOMMITTEE ON ANTITRUST  
AND MONOPOLY,  
February 1, 1962.

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD,  
Chairman, Committee on Rules and Administration, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MANSFIELD: As you know, Senate Resolution 287, which I introduced on January 30, calls for the printing of 2,000 additional copies of Senate Report No. 448, entitled "Study of Administered Prices in the Drug Industry," originally printed on June 27, 1961.

This report presents the views of the members of the subcommittee on the investigation of the ethical drug industry during the past 2 years. For this reason there has been a very great demand for copies and the supply is almost exhausted. S. 1552, the drug industry antitrust bill which I introduced last year, is scheduled for legislative action during this session of the 87th Congress. There will therefore be an even greater demand for copies of Senate Report No. 448 by the general public, by universities, and by the drug industry, but particularly by Members of the Congress. It is for this reason that I have made my request for an additional printing.

Sincerely yours,

ESTES KEFAUVER,  
Chairman.

#### REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. JOHNSTON, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments, to which was referred for examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States, dated February 7, 1962, that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon, pursuant to law.

#### BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 2881. A bill for the relief of Comdr. Robert C. Olson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 2882. A bill to amend the Federal Power Act; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

S. 2883. A bill to modify the project for the Beaver Reservoir on the White River, Arkansas, to permit construction of certain water supply facilities; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ROBERTSON (by request):

S. 2884. A bill to amend the Federal Home Loan Bank Act, to give Puerto Rico the same treatment as a State in the election of Federal Home Loan Bank Directors; and

S. 2885. A bill to repeal certain legislation relating to the purchase of silver, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. ROBERTSON when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

#### CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

#### PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF REPORT ENTITLED "ADMINISTERED PRICES, DRUGS"

Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 59) authorizing the printing of additional copies of Senate Report No. 448, 87th Congress, entitled "Study of Administered Prices in the Drug Industry," and submitted a report thereon, which report was ordered to be printed, and the concurrent resolution was considered and agreed to.

(See the above concurrent resolution printed in full, which appears under a separate heading.)

#### RESOLUTION

#### SENATE MEMBERS OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING AND JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE LIBRARY

Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 300) providing for the appointment of Senate members of the Joint Committee on Printing and the Joint Committee on the Library, which was considered and agreed to.

(See the above resolution printed in full, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

#### AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL POWER ACT

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request of the Federal Power Commission, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Federal Power Act. I ask unanimous consent that the letter from the Chairman of the Commission, together with a statement by the Commission relating to the bill, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2882) to amend the Federal Power Act, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letter and statement presented by Mr. MAGNUSON are as follows:

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION,  
Washington, D.C., February 16, 1962.

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON,  
Chairman, Committee on Commerce,  
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Supplementing my letter of January 22 transmitting our recommended amendments to the Natural Gas

Act, there is enclosed herewith a draft bill to amend the Federal Power Act. This draft is intended to carry out the Commission's legislative recommendations (Items 12 through 19) as set forth in its 41st annual report (1961), pages 3-5. As stated in our earlier transmittal, no new draft is submitted to replace S. 1605 and H.R. 6956 relating to internal delegation of Commission authority. We favor this proposal (Item 20) and believe the pending bills are entirely satisfactory. There is also enclosed a statement of our reasons for desiring the enactment of this group of amendments.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH C. SWIDLER,  
Chairman.

#### STATEMENT TO ACCOMPANY DRAFT BILL TO AMEND THE FEDERAL POWER ACT

Our reasons for urging enactment of the various amendments are set forth below in brief. The suggested changes are discussed in the order that we followed in summarizing our legislative proposals in the Commission's 41st annual report. This sequence has been adopted for reasons of convenience, rather than to indicate priority.

##### I

Section I, Items 1 through 11, relates to our proposed amendments to the Natural Gas Act.

##### II

12. Federal Power Act—Exemption of small hydroelectric projects: Pursuant to section 10(i), minor hydroelectric projects licensed by the Commission may be exempted, in the Commission's discretion, from certain conditions and requirements of the act. It is proposed that the dividing line between minor and major projects be changed from 100 to 2,000 horsepower installed capacity. This change in section 10(i) would necessitate corresponding changes in the language of subsections (b) and (e) of section 10. Section 2 of the draft bill to amend the Federal Power Act would enact this recommendation.

S. 1606, 87th Congress, which has the same purpose, passed the Senate on August 14, 1961. As stated in the report of the Senate Commerce Committee to accompany that bill (S. Rept. No. 664, Aug. 4, 1961), projects of less than 2,000 horsepower do not have sufficient significance in the development of water resources to warrant their being made subject to the comprehensive conditions which are commonly attached to licenses for major projects. No control over a licensee would be sacrificed by the amendment, but there would be a saving in regulatory activity, to the mutual advantage of the licensees, the Commission, and the other agencies of the United States having an interest in licensing proceedings.

13. Federal Power Act—Abandonment of interstate facilities and service: Amend section 202 of the act by adding a new subsection (g) requiring Commission approval of the abandonment of interstate electric sales or service. Section 5 of the draft bill would effectuate this proposal. S. 1607, 87th Congress, which contains the same amendment, passed the Senate on August 14, 1961.

The Commission believes that an interstate electric service fulfilling a public need should not be abandoned without a finding by the agency that such abandonment is consistent with the public interest.

Interstate facilities will become of increasing importance as the Nation's electric systems expand their interconnections to take full advantage of the economies of coordinated operations. It is essential that the parties served by these interstate facilities be protected against arbitrary abandonment of service. This bill requiring Commission approval before interstate service could be abandoned would afford all parties this needed protection and thereby encourage

greater use of a fully coordinated and more efficient interstate power supply system. The Senate Commerce Committee, in its report on the bill S. 1607 (S. Rept. 663), concluded that the change was sound and in keeping with the scheme of the act.

14. Federal Power Act—Interconnection of facilities: Amend section 202(b) of the act so as to give the Commission authority to direct interconnection of electric facilities "on its own motion" in the limited circumstances therein provided. Section 202(b) of the act gives the Commission authority to direct interconnections that will not compel the enlargement of generating facilities or impair the public utility's ability to render adequate service to its customers. This proposal would not enlarge the Commission's authority but would merely give it the right to institute the same proceedings on its own motion which may now be instituted upon application of any State commission or of any person engaged in the transmission or sale of electric energy.

15. Federal Power Act—Permanent connections for emergency use: Repeal the last proviso in subsection (d) of section 202 of the act which permits persons engaged in the transmission and sale of electric energy but not subject to the jurisdiction of the Commission to make permanent connections of facilities for the emergency transmission of electric energy in interstate commerce without becoming thereby subject to the jurisdiction of the Commission.

Section 202(d) is a loophole in our jurisdiction which permits a utility to interconnect across State lines for emergency purposes without assuming the responsibilities of other interstate public utilities subject to our jurisdiction. Interconnections among utilities for emergency operations are valuable and it is the Commission's purpose to encourage further interconnections not only for emergencies but to take advantage of all of the savings from a fully interconnected system of power supply in this country. We believe, however, that improvement in the economy and dependability of operations is more than sufficient to encourage utilities to interconnect and that the public interest requires that all interstate operations be treated alike and made subject to the provisions of the Federal Power Act. The present provision permitting permanent interconnections for use in an emergency without subjecting the utility to the other provisions of the act tends to discourage those utilities from utilizing such interconnections for other than emergency purposes. Such interconnections, once made, should be available for all purposes.

16. Federal Power Act—Importation and exportation of electric energy: Repeal subsection (f) of section 202 of the act which removes from the Federal regulatory provisions governing "public utilities" persons transmitting electric energy across an international boundary to or from a State adjacent to the boundary and in which such energy is consumed or generated. Section 4(c) of the draft would effectuate this proposal.

The subsection was added to the statute by act of August 7, 1953 (67 Stat. 461). The repeal proposed by this item is complementary to our proposal to amend the Natural Gas Act (see Item 10).

Foreign commerce in electric energy is an integrally related part of the whole national power complex. Its importance is indicated by the existing requirement that exportation is permitted only with Commission approval (sec. 202(e)). We do not believe that the area carved out of the Federal jurisdiction by the 1953 amendment to the Power Act should remain a "no man's land." Transmission of electric energy by utilities operating in border States across international boundaries to or from border States is at least as much affected with a

public interest as is transmission by the same or other utilities between States within the boundaries of the United States. There is no sound reason for the exemption, and every reason why an important electric system engaging in transportation across international boundaries should be subject to the same regulation as if its transactions took place with power companies in sister States.

17. Federal Power Act—Additional authority with respect to the transmission of electric energy in foreign commerce: (a) Amend sections 201 and 202(e) of the act so as to include foreign commerce within the coverage of the act and define persons engaged in the importation and exportation of electric energy as "public utilities" so far as their operations in the United States are concerned, and (b) revise section 202(e) so as to require Commission authority to import as well as export electric energy and to provide that orders issued pursuant thereto be entered upon findings that the proposed importation or exportation would not impair the sufficiency of the supply in the United States or impede the coordination in the public interest of jurisdictional facilities (rather than, as now provided, that such orders "shall issue" unless the Commission finds that the supply would be impaired or coordination in the public interest impeded). Sections 4(a) and 4(b) of the draft would enact this recommendation.

Jurisdiction over the importation of electric energy is as necessary to make effective the coordination of facilities in integrated systems as is the control of exportation now provided by the act. The amendment to section 202(e) would, in addition, place the burden of supporting any proposed importation or exportation more clearly upon the applicant where it is properly belongs.

18. Federal Power Act—Filing license and cost documents: Repeal the requirements in section 4(b) and section 6 of the Federal Power Act that statements of licensed project cost and copies of licenses be filed with the Secretary of the Treasury and the General Accounting Office, respectively. Section 1 of the draft would effectuate the repeal.

The filings have been found by the agencies involved to be unnecessary in the public interest. Both Treasury and GAO concur in the recommendation.

19. Federal Power Act—Expiration of licenses; recapture standards: Amend section 14 of the act, relating to the right of the United States to take over, maintain, and operate a hydroelectric project upon the expiration of the license therefor, so as to direct the Commission, prior to the expiration of license, to make a study and investigation and to prepare recommendations with respect to the future ownership and operation of the project works involved. Also, amend the section to declare that the standard by which the Commission shall be guided in making such recommendations shall be the most effective conservation and utilization of the Nation's water resources in the public interest. Section 3 of the draft bill would enact this proposal.

The Federal Water Power Act (now part I of the Federal Power Act) was enacted in 1920 and the first of these licenses with 50-year terms will expire in 1970. Section 14 of the act provides that when licenses expire the United States has the right to take over and operate the project works. However, the section does not fix a standard or establish procedures which would aid Congress in determining whether the United States should exercise its recapture rights. Without some procedure for determining the future of these projects there will be great uncertainty as to their status and the status of the power systems of which they are a part. There will also be uncertainty as to whether the Government's recapture rights can be made effective. The proposed amendment seeks to fill this gap in the interest of the power

systems involved as well as provide a procedure to aid Congress in exercising its statutory recapture rights.

The Commission, in view of its comprehensive responsibilities relating to electric energy and its experience in licensing and then regulating the very projects which are subject to recapture, is uniquely qualified to consider the many factors bearing upon the public interest, including the effect which recapture would have upon existing power systems, as well as the most advantageous use of the project works for all public purposes. We urge early enactment of the proposal to permit the Commission to begin its studies of these projects at once so that the Commission's recommendations will be available to Congress sufficiently in advance of the time when the licenses begin to expire to aid Congress in reaching timely decisions under the recapture provisions of the statute.

### III

20. Delegation of functions: Amend the Federal Power and Natural Gas Act so as to give the Commission authority to delegate (with certain exceptions) to subordinates any portion of its work, business, or functions now requiring Commission action under those acts. No new language is being submitted since the pending bills, S. 1605 and H.R. 6956, are entirely satisfactory.

The Commission has before it large numbers of more or less formal applications which involve no novel questions of policy or principle but merely a routine determination that the facts are as represented. Authority to delegate matters of this kind would conserve the time and energy of the Commissioners, permit a more orderly dispatch of its work, and permit Commission action with dispatch on matters covered by delegations whether or not a quorum of the Commission was available.

### EQUALITY AS A STATE FOR PUERTO RICO IN ELECTION OF FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK DIRECTORS

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 7 of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act so as to give the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico treatment similar to that of a State in the election of Federal home loan bank directors. This bill is requested by the Chairman of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board.

I ask unanimous consent that his letter of transmittal, together with an enclosed memorandum concerning the bill, be inserted in the Record at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter and memorandum will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 2884) to amend the Federal Home Loan Bank Act, to give Puerto Rico the same treatment as a State in the election of Federal home loan bank directors, introduced by Mr. ROBERTSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The letter and memorandum presented by Mr. ROBERTSON are as follows:

FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD,  
Washington, D.C., February 16, 1962.  
THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.

SIR: There is transmitted herewith a draft for a bill to amend the Federal Home Loan Bank Act so as to give the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico treatment similar to that of a State for the purpose of election of Fed-

eral home loan bank directors. The Federal Home Loan Bank Board recommends that this proposed legislation be enacted.

The provisions of the draft are summarized and explained in an analysis which is transmitted herewith.

Advice has been received from the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the presentation of the draft bill to the Congress from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH P. MCMURRAY,  
Chairman.

### ANALYSIS OF DRAFT OF FEBRUARY 12, 1962, FOR A BILL TO AMEND SECTION 7 OF FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK ACT TO GIVE THE COMMONWEALTH OF PUERTO RICO TREATMENT SIMILAR TO THAT OF A STATE IN THE ELECTION OF FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK DIRECTORS

The attached draft would if enacted give the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico treatment similar to that of a State for the purpose of the election of directors of the Federal Home Loan Bank of the district in which the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico is from time to time located.

It is believed that such recognition is warranted by the degree of self-government obtained by the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and by the growth and stature which the savings and loan industry has attained in that Commonwealth.

Each Federal Home Loan Bank has a board of 12 directors, 8 elected by the members for 2-year terms and 4 appointed by the Federal Home Loan Bank Board for 4-year terms, except that in a district of 5 or more States the Board may increase the elective directors to not over 13 and the appointive directors to not more than half the number of elective directors. Such an increase has been made only in the district of the Federal Home Loan Bank of San Francisco.

Under previous law, the eight elective directors of a bank were divided into four equal groups, representing respectively the large, medium-sized, and small members and the members at large. However, Public Law 87-211, approved September 8, 1961, and effective on January 2, 1962, abolished this division into groups. It provides, instead, that the elective directorships of a district shall from time to time be allocated by the Board among the States of the district in approximate proportion to the required stock holdings of the members from the respective States, with a minimum of one and a maximum of six and an overriding grandfather clause preserving, as a minimum, each State's representation as it existed on December 31, 1960.

For election purposes the term "State" is defined, both in the previous law and under Public Law 87-211, as meaning "the States of the Union and the District of Columbia." Consequently, the members located in Puerto Rico—which is presently in the district of the Federal Home Loan Bank of New York—will not have the right to have any elective directorship specifically set apart for them. They will have the right, under other provisions of the amended statute, to be designated as "located" in one of the States of the district, and to participate in the nomination and election of directors representing that State. This, however, would merely prevent them from being disfranchised, and would not afford them specific representation on the board of the Bank.

Under the attached draft, the definition in question would be amended to read as follows: "The term 'States' or 'State' as used in this section shall mean the States of the Union, the District of Columbia, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico." If this definition were adopted, Puerto Rico would be treated the same as the States of the

Union and the District of Columbia in the allocation of elective directorships.

However, such a change in definition would not increase the number of elective directorships of the district, and under certain conditions it could result in situations in which the allocation of a directorship to Puerto Rico would mean that some other State would be deprived of an elective directorship which would otherwise be assigned to it. Further, it would not make possible the assignment to Puerto Rico of a specific directorship without the necessity of making repeated use of the grandfather clause to preserve the December 31, 1960, representation of some other State.

In order to mitigate these situations, the attached draft provides that the Board, by regulation or otherwise, may add an additional elective directorship to the board of directors of the bank of any district in which the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico is included at the time such directorship is added and which does not then include five or more States. It may be noted that if the district included five or more States the situation could then be handled, in any situation likely to arise, by the exercise of the power of the Board to increase the number of elective directors of such district.

The draft provides that the Board may fix the commencement and the duration, not to exceed 2 years, of the initial term of a directorship so added, and may fill such initial term by appointment. The Board would thus be able to provide such a directorship immediately upon the effective date of the measure. Also, the draft provides for designation of such additional directorship for the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and for the automatic cessation of its existence if the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico should cease to be included in the district. In that event the power to establish an additional directorship could be used again in the district to which the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico was transferred, assuming that the condition necessary to its exercise existed in that district.

No appreciable or significant increase in expenses of the Board would, it is believed, be caused by enactment of the proposed legislation.

#### REPEAL OF SILVER PURCHASE ACTS

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, last November the President announced the decision to ask for the eventual demonetization of silver, except for its use in subsidiary coinage. At that time he instructed the Secretary of the Treasury to stop selling free silver and to suspend the use of free silver held by the Treasury for coinage. Instead, to meet coinage needs, the President directed the Secretary of the Treasury to use silver obtained by retiring appropriate amounts of \$5 and \$10 silver certificates.

The President announced at that time that he would seek additional legislation to carry out this policy. Subsequently, in his Economic Report transmitted January 20, 1962, the President reiterated his intention to recommend a revision of our silver policy.

The Senate has now received a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury enclosing a draft of a proposed bill which would carry out the decision announced last November.

In accordance with this request, I introduce the bill transmitted by Secretary Dillon, and I ask unanimous consent that the letter of transmittal dated February 20, 1962, and the correspondence between

the Secretary of the Treasury and the President in November of 1961 be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter and correspondence will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2885) to repeal certain legislation relating to the purchase of silver, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. ROBERTSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The letter and correspondence presented by Mr. ROBERTSON are as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,  
Washington, D.C., February 20, 1962.

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,  
President of the Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Last November the President directed me to suspend further sales of free silver and to suspend the use of free silver for coinage. He also directed that silver to meet coinage needs be obtained by retiring \$5 and \$10 silver certificates. At the same time he said that he would recommend to Congress that it repeal the acts relating to the purchase of silver, that is, the acts of June 19, 1934, July 6, 1939, and July 31, 1946, as well as the provisions of law imposing a tax on the transfers of interest in silver bullion. In addition, he said he would ask Congress to authorize the Federal Reserve banks to issue Federal Reserve notes of \$1 denomination.

The attached draft of bill would accomplish these ends.

The Silver Purchase Act of 1934 had for its main purpose the purchase of silver, particularly foreign and secondary silver, until silver should comprise one-fourth of our total gold and silver monetary stocks. At the time this act was enacted it was estimated that the purchase of approximately 1.3 billion ounces of silver would accomplish that end. Yet while over 2 billion ounces were purchased under the act, by the beginning of 1942 silver comprised only 15.7 percent of our gold and silver monetary stocks. The act did not make purchases mandatory, however, providing rather that they should be made only at such times as the Secretary of the Treasury found it in the public interest. Since 1942, no Secretary of the Treasury has deemed it to be in the public interest to purchase silver under this act. In view of this, the act has in fact been inoperative for 20 years.

The act of July 6, 1939, provided for the receipt of newly mined domestic silver by the Treasury at a specified price, but the operating provisions of this act were superseded by the act of July 31, 1946, under which the Treasury has since that time purchased newly mined domestic silver and made sales of silver for industrial purposes. The supply and demand for silver during the period July 31, 1946, to early 1959 resulted in the Treasury purchasing 375 million ounces of newly mined domestic silver, whereas it sold less than 24 million ounces during the same period. After early 1959, market conditions had changed so that the Treasury sold silver continuously until sales were stopped on November 28, 1961, when the free stocks from which sales were made were almost exhausted. During that period the Treasury purchased only about a million ounces of silver while selling more than 115 million ounces. Since both purchases and sales under it have completely stopped, the 1946 act is not now operative.

When the Silver Purchase Act was enacted in 1934, speculation in silver futures led to the inclusion of a provision, now incorporated in the Internal Revenue Code, imposing a 50-percent tax on the gain from the

transfer of an interest in silver bullion. This regulatory tax will not be needed when the silver purchase legislation is repealed. It should be made ineffective with respect to transfers of silver acquired after enactment of the repealing legislation in order to permit the establishment of a futures market in silver.

The slightly more than \$2 billion of silver certificates in circulation as of December 31, 1961, constituted less than 7 percent of our total of more than \$31 billion of paper currency. The Treasury is now gradually retiring these silver certificates in order to release silver for coinage needs. About 500 million ounces, roughly an 8-year coinage supply, can be obtained by retiring silver certificates in denominations of \$5 and larger. The Federal Reserve System, which now provides about 97 percent of the currency in these denominations, can provide any additional amounts found to be necessary. To secure further supplies of silver it will be necessary to retire \$1 silver certificates, which will provide a further 20- to 25-year supply based upon present coinage requirements. Since at present the Federal Reserve banks can issue notes only in denominations of \$5 and larger, the proposed bill would provide for necessary currency in the \$1 denomination by authorizing the Federal Reserve banks to issue it.

The conditions of the depression years which led to the adoption of the silver legislation no longer exist. The purchases of silver by the Treasury between 1934 and 1959 took off the market the large surplus that was depressing the price. More recently, however, industrial uses of silver have expanded so greatly, and industrial consumption is so steadily increasing, that legislation designed to support the price of silver as a commodity is not necessary. Silver is already being withdrawn from our currency reserves, and it is now time to repeal the out-of-date silver purchase legislation.

It is requested that you lay the proposed bill, which will carry out the specific recommendations of the President in his Economic Report, before the Senate. A similar proposal has been sent to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that this proposal is in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,

DOUGLAS DILLON.

THE WHITE HOUSE,

Washington, D.C., November 28, 1961.

HON. DOUGLAS DILLON,  
Secretary of the Treasury,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: On the basis of your recommendations and the studies conducted by the Treasury and other departments, I have reached the decision that silver metal should gradually be withdrawn from our monetary reserves.

Simultaneously with the publication of this letter, you are directed to suspend further sales of free silver, and to suspend use of free silver held by the Treasury for coinage. In this way, the remaining stock and any subsequently acquired can be used, at your discretion, to contribute to the maintenance of an orderly market in silver and for such other special purposes as you may determine. In order to meet coinage needs, the amount of silver required for this purpose should be obtained by retirement from circulation of a sufficient number of \$5 and \$10 silver certificates.

Pursuant to this general determination, I intend to recommend to Congress, when it reconvenes, that it repeal the acts relating to silver of June 19, 1934, July 6, 1939, and July 31, 1946. The existing tax on transfers of interest in silver bullion has been necessary only to provide reinforcement for this legislation. I will therefore simultaneously

propose that the relevant portion of the Internal Revenue Code also be repealed.

These actions will permit the establishment of a broad market for trading in silver on a current and forward basis comparable to the markets in which other commodities are traded. Our new policy will in effect provide for the eventual demonetization of silver except for its use in subsidiary coinage.

Although the potential supply of silver now embodied in the outstanding \$5 and \$10 certificates will be sufficient to cover coinage requirements for a number of years, I believe this is an appropriate time to provide for the gradual release of the silver now required as backing for \$1 and \$2 silver certificates. I shall therefore also recommend that legislation be enacted to accomplish this purpose and authorize the Federal Reserve banks to include these denominations in the range of notes they are permitted to issue.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,  
Washington, D.C., November 27, 1961.

THE PRESIDENT,  
The White House.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Treasury has, as you requested, been studying for some time the uses of silver in our monetary system. Informal conferences have also been held with other departments in your administration, with the Federal Reserve, and with leading representatives of both silver producing and consuming interests. It now seems appropriate to recommend several changes in our silver procedures, largely because of the change that has taken place in the world position of silver.

The industrial uses of silver have been expanding greatly and the industrial consumption of silver is steadily increasing; it continues to be used extensively in the arts; it is needed in our coinage. All together, the industrial, artistic and coinage uses of silver are currently consuming more than 150 million ounces of silver per year in the United States. The total worldwide consumption is estimated at more than 300 million. Production, however, falls far short of these totals. Worldwide it is currently estimated at 235 million ounces annually, of which only about 35 million is produced in the United States. The indicated gap between world production and world consumption, apart from changes in inventories, is thus now running at about 65 million ounces.

This gap, and it is a growing one, has for some time been filled by sales from the stocks of free silver held by the U.S. Treasury. These stocks were accumulated in earlier years when total demand was much lower and purchases by the U.S. Treasury, at the minimum price established by the Congress for monetary purposes, absorbed virtually all new domestic production. The Treasury's supply of free silver reached its peak in April 1959 at 222 million ounces. Since that time, purchases have steadily decreased and sales have increased and the Treasury's stock of free silver has declined. By the end of 1959 it was 174 million ounces; by the end of 1960 it had fallen to 123 million ounces; as of today, following unusually rapid sales in recent weeks, it has fallen to about 22 million fine ounces.

It is clear that under present procedures this stock would soon be entirely exhausted and that the Treasury would thereafter have no further silver available for public sale. It also seems clear on the basis of these developments that there is no remaining need for Government support of the silver price at 90.5 cents, as provided under current legislation. In the absence of further Government sales of free silver, the private market is quite obviously prepared to absorb all domestic production at or above the price of 90.5 cents.

The Government still has, however, nearly 1.7 billion ounces in a bullion reserve held against the issuance of a part of our paper currency. Roughly one-quarter of the total is held against \$5 and \$10 silver certificates, although existing legislation also permits issuance of \$5 and \$10 notes by the Federal Reserve, and these latter notes represent well over 90 percent of the outstanding currency of these denominations. The other three-quarters of the silver bullion reserve is used to support \$1 and \$2 silver certificates; under existing law, only silver certificates are authorized for currency of these denominations.

In view of the large and growing aggregate demand for silver, it does not seem to me to be either wise or feasible to continue to impound a substantial holding of silver bullion in these currency reserves. I propose that we now begin an actual, though gradual, withdrawal of silver bullion from the currency reserves, permitting substitution of Federal Reserve notes for the silver certificates withdrawn, and using the bullion thereby released to meet our continually heavy coinage requirements. At the same time, under the authority of existing law, I propose to suspend further sales of silver to the market. I further recommend that appropriate legislation be requested promptly to remove the Treasury from an active role in the markets for the purchase and sale of silver, and to permit trading in silver as a primary commodity. Meanwhile, the Treasury's remaining stocks of free silver should be conserved for possible use in contributing to orderly market conditions pending enactment of the necessary legislation.

If you should desire to implement this general policy, the first step would be a Presidential directive to the Secretary of the Treasury to suspend further sales from the remaining stock of free silver. Uses of this remaining stock for subsidiary coinage should be terminated, and to meet coinage needs I would propose to retire from circulation a sufficient amount of \$5 and \$10 silver certificates to release the silver required for this purpose. These retired certificates would be replaced by Federal Reserve notes.

Paralleling this action it would be desirable to recommend to Congress, when it reconvenes, the immediate repeal of the Silver Purchase Act of 1934, as well as the acts relating to silver of July 6, 1939, and July 31, 1946. Since the existing tax on transfers of interest in silver bullion is necessary only to support this legislation, it would also be desirable to propose simultaneously to Congress that the relevant part of the Internal Revenue Code be repealed so as to permit the development of a free futures market in silver.

Finally, I suggest that you consider recommending to Congress the enactment of legislation authorizing the Federal Reserve System to issue Federal Reserve notes in denominations of less than \$5, thus providing an orderly, long-term means for replacing or supplementing the supply of silver certificates and thereby freeing the supplies of silver that will be needed to cover future coinage requirements.

Faithfully yours,

DOUGLAS DILLON.

#### NOTICE OF RECEIPT OF NOMINATION BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the Senate on February 19 received the nomination of Mr. Paul F. Geren, of Texas, to be Deputy Director of the Peace Corps, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate. In accord-

ance with the rules of the Committee on Foreign Relations, his nomination is eligible to be acted upon after 6 days.

#### NOTICE CONCERNING CERTAIN NOMINATIONS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the following nominations have been referred to and are now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary:

Marion Mathias Hale, of Texas, to be U.S. marshal, southern district of Texas.

Robert I. Nash, of Texas, to be U.S. marshal, northern district of Texas.

Tully Reynolds, of Texas, to be U.S. marshal, eastern district of Texas.

Cornelius J. McQuade, of West Virginia, to be U.S. marshal, southern district of West Virginia, vice Russell R. Bell, resigned.

Antonio C. Baza, of Guam, to be U.S. marshal, district of Guam.

On behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, notice is hereby given to all persons interested in these nominations to file with the committee, in writing, on or before Thursday, March 1, 1962, any representations or objections they may wish to present concerning the above nominations, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearing which may be scheduled.

#### RESOLUTIONS REPORTED FROM COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I send to the desk resolutions reported today by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] from the Committee on Rules and Administration. They have been cleared with the appropriate Members of the Senate. I request the immediate consideration of the resolutions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered; and the resolutions will be stated.

#### STUDY BY COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES ON STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL STOCKPILING

The resolution (S. Res. 295) to authorize a study by the Committee on Armed Services on strategic and critical stockpiling, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Armed Services, or its Subcommittee on the National Stockpile and Naval Petroleum Reserves, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to the acquisition, storage, and disposal of strategic and critical materials necessary for the common defense.

SEC. 2. For the purpose of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1962, to January 31, 1963, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so

selected, shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than \$1,400 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$30,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement explaining the purposes of this measure.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This resolution would authorize the expenditure of \$30,000 by the Committee on Armed Services, or its Subcommittee on the National Stockpile and Naval Petroleum Reserves, from February 1, 1962, through January 31, 1963—"to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to the acquisition, storage, and disposal of strategic and critical materials necessary for the common defense."

Additional information relative to the purposes of the proposed investigation are contained in a letter to Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, from Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL, chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, which letter (with accompanying budget) is as follows:

U.S. SENATE,  
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,  
February 9, 1962.

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,  
Chairman, Committee on Rules and Administration, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Senate Resolution 295, now pending before your committee, would authorize expenditures of not to exceed \$30,000 by the Committee on Armed Services for its Subcommittee on the National Stockpile and Naval Petroleum Reserves.

The purpose of this resolution is to permit the subcommittee to perform the investigation of stockpiling of strategic and critical materials requested by the President in his press conference on February 1.

The Subcommittee on the National Stockpile and Naval Petroleum Reserves has been in existence for several years. Staff assistance to the subcommittee has been provided by a member of the committee's professional staff. Accomplishment of a comprehensive study of stockpiling will require additional staff assistance. A copy of the subcommittee's proposed budget for the remainder of this year is attached. The expenditure authorization requested by this resolution is relatively small in relation to the magnitude of the sums involved in the stockpile program.

I would appreciate your scheduling this resolution for consideration as promptly as is convenient.

With cordial regards, I am,  
Sincerely,

RICHARD B. RUSSELL.

6-month estimate of subcommittee staff	
Counsel	\$8,000
2 investigators	14,000
1 secretary	3,500
Sundry expenses, including travel	4,500
Total	30,000

## STUDY OF REFUGEES AND ESCAPEES BY THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 293) to investigate problems created by the flow of escapees and refugees from communistic tyranny, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with an amendment on page 2, in line 17, to strike out "\$100,000," and insert "\$75,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to the problems created by the flow of escapees and refugees from Communist tyranny.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee from February 1, 1962, to January 31, 1963, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ on a temporary basis technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than \$1,400 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1963.

SEC. 4. The expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$75,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate by vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This resolution as referred would have authorized the expenditure of not to exceed \$100,000 by the Committee on the Judiciary, acting through its Subcommittee on Refugees and Escapees, to continue from February 1, 1962, through January 31, 1963, its inquiry into difficulties created by the flow of refugees and escapees from the Communist tyranny. The amendment adopted by the Committee on Rules and Administration would reduce the authorized expenditures from \$100,000 to \$75,000.

The purposes of the resolution are more fully stated in a letter from Senator PHILIP A. HART, chairman of the Subcommittee on Refugees and Escapees, to Senator JAMES O. EASTLAND, chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, which letter (with accompanying budget) and letter of transmittal from Senator EASTLAND to Senator MIKE MANSFIELD,

chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, are as follows:

U.S. SENATE,  
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,  
February 5, 1962.

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,  
Chairman, Committee on Rules and Administration, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Enclosed is the budget which was approved by the Committee on the Judiciary at its meeting on January 18, 1962, for the work of the Subcommittee on Refugees and Escapees.

The committee authorized the reporting of Senate Resolution 293 to the Senate, to provide \$100,000 for the work of the subcommittee from February 1, 1962, through January 31, 1963.

The program of the subcommittee is fully set forth in a letter to me from the Honorable PHILIP A. HART, chairman of the subcommittee. I am enclosing with this letter to you the proposed budget for the use of the Committee on Rules and Administration at your forthcoming meeting.

With kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

JAMES O. EASTLAND,  
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary.

U.S. SENATE,  
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,  
January 30, 1962.

Hon. JAMES O. EASTLAND,  
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,  
U.S. Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Enclosed is the recommended budget for the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Refugees and Escapees for the period beginning on February 1, 1962, and extending through January 31, 1963. There is also enclosed a suggested draft of a new authorization for the subcommittee identical in language with the prior authorizing resolution.

The existence of refugees is the most telling indictment of totalitarian rule. They represent the weakest link in the Communist chain of power. They are men and women who leave all to find freedom. They vote with their feet what we speak with our voices.

The subcommittee has approached the refugee problem as an opportunity for the United States to develop a series of programs which will be a positive force in expanding and unifying the boundaries of the free world. Perhaps the opportunities and the real responsibilities could not have been so clearly apparent except as in today's light and with the Cuban refugees in our midst. We believe that our work during 1961 has established a sound beginning toward that end.

The subcommittee's activities of the last year are reported in detail in two reports (1) the annual report on world refugee problems, and (2) a report on the Cuban refugee problems in the United States. These reports cover only 6 months of our activity as it was not possible to assemble a staff until June of 1961. During these months, however, the subcommittee began studies in a number of areas and two separate sets of hearings were conducted which resulted in the reports referred to above. As a result of this limited period of activity, the subcommittee will be able to return about \$10,000 of last year's appropriation.

In the coming year, the subcommittee proposes intensive studies on a number of refugee problems, including:

1. Future operations of the U.S. escapee program in Europe.
2. Proposals for increased governmental cooperation with voluntary agencies in programs to assist refugees to become self-supporting instead of providing subsistence indefinitely.

3. Proposals to assist the 2 million refugees from Communist China in the British Crown Colony of Hong Kong, including the development of opportunities for resettlement in other countries.

It is my belief that the above investigations, in addition to others in the process of development, will provide useful information to the members of the Committee on the Judiciary and the Senate in their consideration of legislation and appropriations concerned with refugee problems.

Sincerely,

PHILIP A. HART,  
Chairman, Subcommittee on  
Refugees and Escapees.

*Budget: Subcommittee on Refugees and Escapees*

Position	Number	Base salary per annum	Gross salary per annum	Monthly gross	Total for period of budget (gross)
Staff:					
Legal and investigative:					
General counsel or staff director	1	\$8,040	\$16,173.19	\$1,347.77	\$16,173.19
Counsel	1	7,260	14,802.38	1,233.53	14,802.38
Minority counsel	1	7,260	14,802.38	1,233.53	14,802.38
Editorial and research: Consultant	1	4,620	10,060.30	838.36	10,060.30
Administrative and clerical:					
Chief clerk	1	3,720	8,239.40	686.62	8,239.40
Assistant clerk (secretary to director)	1	2,160	5,079.97	423.33	5,079.97
Stenographer	1	2,160	5,079.97	423.33	5,079.97
Total	7	35,220	74,237.59	6,186.46	74,237.59

ADMINISTRATIVE

Contribution to employees health benefit programs (Public Law 86-382, effective July 1, 1960)	426.00
Contribution to civil service retirement fund (6½ percent of total salaries paid)	4,825.44
Contribution to employees Federal employees group life insurance (27 cents per month per \$1,000 coverage)	243.00
Travel (inclusive of field investigations)	10,000.00
Hearings (inclusive of reporters' fees)	3,000.00
Witness fees, expenses	5,000.00
Stationery, office supplies	1,000.00
Communications (telephone, telegraph)	800.00
Newspapers, magazines, documents	300.00
Contingent fund	167.97
Total	25,762.41
Grand total	100,000.00

NOTE.—Funds requested, S. Res. 293, \$100,000.

**DR. CARYL P. HASKINS, BOARD OF REGENTS, SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION**

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 152) to provide for the reappointment of Dr. Caryl P. Haskins as Citizen Regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, of the class other than Members of Congress, which will occur by the expiration of the term of Doctor Caryl P. Haskins, of Washington, District of Columbia, on April 6, 1962, be filled by the reappointment of the present incumbent for the statutory term of six years.*

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement explaining the purposes of this measure.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Title 20, section 42, United States Code, provides in relation to the Institution's Board of Regents that in addition to the Vice President and the Chief Justice of the United States, and Members of Congress, the Board shall be composed of " \* \* \* six other persons, other than Members of Congress, two of whom shall be resident in the city of Washington; and the other four shall be inhabitants of some State, but no two of them of the same State."

Dr. Haskins' reappointment is within the classification of Citizen Regents who are residents of the District of Columbia.

tion to the members of the Committee on the Judiciary and the Senate in their consideration of legislation and appropriations concerned with refugee problems.

Sincerely,

PHILIP A. HART,  
Chairman, Subcommittee on  
Refugees and Escapees.

ing the Second World War he was active in scientific research for the U.S. Government. For this service he was awarded the U.S. Certificate of Merit. He succeeded Dr. Vannevar Bush as president of the Carnegie Institution of Washington. He is the author of books and articles dealing with scientific subjects in the fields of physics and natural history.

Dr. Haskins is a resident of Washington, D.C.

**DR. CRAWFORD H. GREENEWALT, BOARD OF REGENTS, SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION**

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 153) to provide for the reappointment of Dr. Crawford H. Greenewalt as Citizen Regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, of the class other than Members of Congress, which will occur by the expiration of the term of Doctor Crawford H. Greenewalt, of Wilmington, Delaware, on April 6, 1962, be filled by the reappointment of the present incumbent for the statutory term of six years.*

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement explaining the purposes of this measure.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Title 20, section 42, United States Code, provides in relation to the Institution's Board of Regents that in addition to the Vice President and the Chief Justice of the United States, and Members of Congress, the Board shall be composed of " \* \* \* six other persons, other than Members of Congress, two of whom shall be resident in the city of Washington; and the other four shall be inhabitants of some State, but no two of them of the same State."

Dr. Greenewalt's reappointment is within the classification of Citizen Regents who are resident outside the District of Columbia.

A letter in support of Senate Joint Resolution 153 addressed to Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, by Dr. Remington Kellogg, Acting Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, with accompanying biography of Dr. Greenewalt, is as follows:

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION,  
Washington, D.C., February 7, 1962.

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD,  
Chairman, Committee on Rules and Administration, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MANSFIELD: Thank you very much indeed for your letter of February 5, 1962, together with the enclosed copy of Senate Joint Resolution 153, a resolution to provide for the reappointment of Dr. Crawford H. Greenewalt as Citizen Regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

I am enclosing with this letter a brief biographical statement on Crawford H. Greenewalt. A much longer biography is available in "Who's Who in America."

At the recent annual meeting of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, held on January 25, 1962, it was unanimously voted to reappoint Dr. Greenewalt. The following Members of the Senate were present as Regents at this meeting: Hon. CLINTON P. ANDERSON, Hon. J. W. FULBRIGHT, Hon. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL.

A letter in support of Senate Joint Resolution 152, addressed to Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, by Dr. Remington Kellogg, Acting Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, with accompanying biography of Dr. Haskins, is as follows:

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION,  
Washington, D.C., February 7, 1962.

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD,  
Chairman, Committee on Rules and Administration, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MANSFIELD: Thank you very much indeed for your letter of February 5, 1962, together with the enclosed copy of Senate Joint Resolution 152, a resolution to provide for the reappointment of Dr. Caryl P. Haskins as Citizen Regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

I am enclosing with this letter a brief biographical statement on Caryl P. Haskins. A much longer biography is available in "Who's Who in America."

At the recent annual meeting of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, held on January 25, 1962, it was unanimously voted to reappoint Dr. Haskins. The following Members of the Senate were present as Regents at this meeting: Hon. CLINTON P. ANDERSON, Hon. J. W. FULBRIGHT, Hon. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL.

Please let me know if I can provide you with any further information concerning this matter.

Sincerely yours,

REMINGTON KELLOGG,  
Acting Secretary.

**BRIEF BIOGRAPHICAL STATEMENT, CARYL PARKER HASKINS**

Caryl Parker Haskins, administrator and research scientist. He is a native of Schenectady, N.Y., was graduated from Yale University and holds the degree of Ph. D. from Harvard University. He is a member of the National Academy of Sciences. Dur-

Please let me know if I can provide you with any further information concerning this matter.

Sincerely yours,

REMINGTON KELLOGG,  
Acting Secretary.

BRIEF BIOGRAPHICAL STATEMENT, CRAWFORD  
HALLOCK GREENEWALT

Crawford Hallock Greenewalt, business executive and research scientist, is a native of Cummington, Mass., and a graduate of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. He is a member of the National Academy of Sciences, and has published extensive research papers in chemistry and also in biology. He is president of the E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co.

Mr. Greenewalt is a resident of Wilmington, Del.

PRINTING AS SENATE DOCUMENT  
OF REPORT ENTITLED "A REPORT  
OF U.S. FOREIGN POLICY AND  
OPERATIONS"

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 56) to print as a Senate document a report entitled "A Report of U.S. Foreign Policy and Operations" was considered and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring),* That there be printed with illustrations, as a Senate document, a report entitled "A Report of United States Foreign Policy and Operations", submitted by Senator ALLEN J. ELLENDER to the Senate Committee on Appropriations on January 24, 1962; and that four thousand additional copies be printed for the use of that committee.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement explaining the purposes of this measure.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on Rules and Administration, to whom was referred the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 56) authorizing the printing, with illustrations, as a Senate document of a report entitled "A Report of U.S. Foreign Policy and Operations," submitted by Senator ALLEN J. ELLENDER to the Senate Committee on Appropriations on January 24, 1962, with 4,000 additional copies of said document being printed for the use of that committee, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the concurrent resolution be agreed to by the Senate.

The printing-cost estimate, submitted by the Public Printer is as follows.

To print as a document (1,500 copies).....	\$1,167.97
4,000 additional copies at \$383.98 per thousand.....	1,535.92

Total estimated cost, S. Con.

Res. 56..... 2,703.89

A letter in support of Senate Concurrent Resolution 56, addressed to Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, by Senator ALLEN J. ELLENDER, author of the resolution, is as follows:

U.S. SENATE,  
COMMITTEE ON  
AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY,  
February 20, 1962.

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD,  
Chairman, Committee on Rules and Administration, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I would appreciate prompt action by your committee in ordering re-

ported Senate Concurrent Resolution 56, to print as a Senate document my report covering my tour abroad last fall, entitled "A Report of U.S. Foreign Policy and Operations."

I have received numerous requests from departments of Government, as well as some of our Embassies abroad, and many individuals, to have the report printed as a Senate document. I have already almost completely exhausted the committee print of my report, and my office is holding many requests for copies until such time as the report may be printed as an official document of the Senate.

Thanking you for your usual prompt attention to this matter, I am,  
Sincerely,

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,  
U.S. Senator.

PRINTING OF COPIES OF HEARING  
ON EXPORT OF STRATEGIC MA-  
TERIALS TO SOVIET-BLOC COUN-  
TRIES

The resolution (S. Res. 297) to print copies of a hearing on export of strategic materials to Soviet-bloc countries was considered and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved,* That there be printed for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary three thousand copies of a hearing entitled "Export of Strategic Materials to the U.S.S.R. and Other Soviet Bloc Countries, Part 2," held by its Internal Security Subcommittee during the Eighty-seventh Congress, first session.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on Rules and Administration to whom was referred the resolution (S. Res. 297) authorizing the printing for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary of 3,000 additional copies of a hearing entitled "Export of Strategic Materials to the U.S.S.R. and Other Soviet Bloc Countries, Part 2," held by its Internal Security Subcommittee during the 87th Congress, first session, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the resolution be agreed to by the Senate.

The printing-cost estimate, supplied by the Public Printer, is as follows: 3,000 additional copies at \$392.48 per thousand: \$1,177.44.

A letter in support of Senate Resolution 297, addressed to Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, by Senator JAMES O. EASTLAND, chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary and its Internal Security Subcommittee, is as follows:

FEBRUARY 19, 1962.

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD,  
Chairman, Committee on Rules and Administration, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I have introduced today a resolution providing for the printing of 3,000 extra copies of a hearing titled "Export of Strategic Materials to the U.S.S.R. and Other Soviet Bloc Countries, Part 2," held by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee during the first session of the 87th Congress.

This hearing has been the object of considerable interest. Our requests for printed transcripts are considerable, and the supply we will receive under our regular printing allotment will in all likelihood fall far short of the subcommittee's requirements.

You will recall that earlier hearings conducted by the Internal Security Subcommit-

tee on this subject resulted in a change of procedure in granting export licenses, a change which I believe was of benefit to the Nation. The hearing which would be printed under this resolution is a further step in our examination of a vital topic.

I would be most grateful for your assistance in securing early and favorable action on this resolution by the Committee on Rules and Administration, and subsequently by the Senate.

With kindest personal regards.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES O. EASTLAND,  
Chairman, Internal Security  
Subcommittee.

PRINTING OF PAMPHLET ENTITLED  
"COMMONWEALTH PARLIAMEN-  
TARY ASSOCIATION MEETING,  
LONDON, ENGLAND, 1961"

The resolution (S. Res. 290) to print, with additional copies, a pamphlet entitled "Commonwealth Parliamentary Association Meeting, London, England, 1961," was considered and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved,* That the pamphlet entitled "Commonwealth Parliamentary Association Meeting, London, England, 1961" be printed as a Senate document and that three thousand additional copies be printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement explaining the purposes of this resolution.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on Rules and Administration to whom was referred the resolution (S. Res. 290) authorizing the printing as a Senate document of the pamphlet entitled "Commonwealth Parliamentary Association Meeting London, England, 1961," with 3,000 additional copies to be printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Relations, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendments and recommend that the resolution be agreed to by the Senate.

The printing-cost estimate supplied by the Government Printing Office is as follows:

To print as a document (1,500 copies).....	\$474.48
3,000 additional copies at \$39.27 per thousand.....	117.81

Total estimated cost, S. Res.  
290..... 592.29

A letter in support of Senate Resolution 290 addressed to Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, by Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT, chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, is as follows:

FEBRUARY 6, 1962.

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD,  
Chairman, Committee on Rules and Administration, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: There is pending before your Committee on Rules and Administration the resolution (S. Res. 290) which I introduced on January 31, 1962.

This resolution would print as a Senate document the report of the Senate delegation to the last meeting of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association in London, September 25-30, 1961.

This Association meets every 2 years, and it has been the custom for American observers, attending its sessions, to submit

their report as a Senate document. It is hoped that your committee will find it feasible to continue this policy by the favorable report of Senate Resolution 290.

Sincerely yours,

J. W. FULBRIGHT,  
Chairman.

#### TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that before the reading of the Farewell Address of the first President of the United States, there may be a short morning hour.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### LEADERSHIP AND SERVICE OF SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE FREEMAN

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a short, but extremely pertinent, editorial by Joe Snyder, editor of the Gallatin North Missourian. The editorial is entitled "After Secretary Freeman?"

Mr. Snyder lives in Gallatin, and publishes his newspaper in northwest Missouri, one of the most important farming areas in our State and the Nation.

I am very glad to note this recognition of the leadership and the service Secretary Freeman is giving the farmers of America.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

##### AFTER SECRETARY FREEMAN?

It now appears that much of the distorted news and comments being handled around the country about the feed grains program is part of a plan to eliminate Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman from the Washington scene. Whether this will be successful or not remains to be seen.

Secretary Freeman, who startled a lot of people by actually representing and fighting for the American farmer, has powerful interests at his throat. It has been a long time since agriculture had a Secretary like Mr. Freeman.

The crackdown on livestock buying practices, watered hams, wheat sedimentation testing, and several other projects, have put Mr. Freeman in a much less favorable light with some big business interests who for years have been making millions off the Government and the public—but blaming it on the farmer. They just don't like to have their little playhouse messed up.

The truth is, the feed grains program has gotten off to a fine start. It is helping to reduce the surplus despite one of the most favorable growing seasons in history. A drop in the carryover is certain. Mr. Benson, for example, could show no drop in surplus any year he held office despite the spending of \$1½ billion on the soil-bank program.

The first cut in grain surplus in 9 years is a big feather in Freeman's hat.

The program is also going to cut Government costs although, as Mr. Freeman warned Congress, it won't show up this year. But what the Government doesn't take over, it doesn't have to store, so storage costs will be less the next few years.

The costs of the program will be lower than most people realize. Most of the \$768 million paid to farmers will be recovered as the certificate corn is sold back into the market. At only \$1 a bushel, the Government should get back, roughly, \$600 million

of the \$768 it has paid out to farmers. Future savings cover the rest, plus some allowances for operating costs, so the program will come close to paying for itself the first year. That's almost unheard of in modern-day farm programing.

Mr. Freeman's program is not perfect but it has shown real progress. Mr. Freeman knows the weaknesses and he will see to have the abuses corrected by Congress. We hope the efforts being made to discredit Mr. Freeman and the feed grains program through pure and simple propaganda and distortion fail. Rural America finally has a Secretary of Agriculture who does something besides apologize for the efficiency of the farmer. He deserves encouragement and support.

#### FAKERY EXPOSED

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Fakery Exposed," which appeared in the Chicago Daily Tribune on Monday, February 19, 1962.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

##### FAKERY EXPOSED

Senator JOHN WILLIAMS, Republican, of Delaware, in a speech used the Department of Agriculture's own statistics as a needle to burst the glorious bubble of claims blown up by the Kennedy administration that its farm program has been a grand success.

The Senator accused the administration of sheer fakery in juggling its books to show that the huge farm surplus stockpile had been reduced by \$1.5 billion. "The administration," he said, "lowered its valuation on the surplus stock to show the reduction." The Senator's blast brought an immediate response from the Agriculture Department, which promptly revised its latest report of Commodity Credit Corporation surplus stocks to more accurately reflect comparisons of current holdings with those of a year ago.

Senator WILLIAMS' complaint was based on the report of CCC stocks as of November 30, 1961, which showed \$7,647,236,000 worth of surplus commodities in inventory and under price supporting loans, compared with a total of \$9,150,087,000 on November 30, 1960. The 1961 figure did not include an estimated loss of \$1,530,503,000 from storage, handling, and transportation costs to be realized when stocks in inventory are disposed of. Before the Kennedy administration took office these estimated losses had been included in the value of inventories.

Now the Agriculture Department has issued a report, dated the same day as the Senator's speech, to show that CCC holdings on December 31, 1961, were \$7,685,946,000, compared with a revised figure of \$7,908,135,000 for a year ago with reserves for losses shown separately.

Senator WILLIAMS also reiterated charges made previously by Representative FINDLEY, Republican, of Illinois, that the administration paid \$700 million to farmers for idling 20 million acres of cropland, but actually succeeded in getting a reduction of only 15.4 million acres.

"The Secretary of Agriculture paid over \$150 million for the removal from production of 4.5 million phantom acres, acreage which would never have been put into feed grains anyway," the Senator asserted.

All of this demonstrates the hypocrisy with which the administration has sought to cover up the monumental failure of its farm policies, while seeking public approbation of them. The administration may not realize it, but the public—and that includes farmers—is getting fed up with political fakery and bookkeeping deception in dealing with the farm problem. Congress, in considering

current administration schemes for more spending and Federal management for agriculture, should weigh the evidence and act accordingly.

#### A FORCE IN READINESS

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, once again California's imaginative and dedicated film industry has emphasized how the motion picture can be a vehicle for communicating vital information, as well as provide engrossing entertainment to the American people.

I trust that Americans in every corner of the Nation and our friends and allies around the globe will see a Hollywood film which filled me with pride and is a thrilling portrayal of the alertness and patriotism of two resolute segments of our armed services.

It was a distinct privilege to view recently the film called "A Force in Readiness," which graphically and dramatically portrays the readiness, capability, and dedication of our Navy and Marine Corps defense team. This film depicts reassuringly the role they are fully prepared to play if our Nation's safety and our peoples' liberties ever are jeopardized by an aggressor.

The film tellingly demonstrates—and I hope for this reason that it may ultimately be shown in the so-called neutral or uncommitted nations—that a vibrant, dedicated defense force is a positive and influential power for peace. No one seeing "A Force in Readiness" can fail to come away with appreciation that even those who wear the uniform of a fighting service are fervently working and praying for peace, just as they are prepared to lay down their lives to preserve our independence and freedom.

As a Californian, I am especially happy to note that this very forceful film was made without cost to the Marine Corps. I feel our Nation owes a substantial debt of gratitude to Warner Bros., and its patriotic, generous president, Jack L. Warner, who put all of his studio's facilities into the production of this picture. Similarly we should be eternally grateful for the unselfish contributions of William L. Hendricks who wrote and produced it, Jack Webb, who did the able narration, and all the others who took part in its making.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I take special pride in the U.S. Marine Corps because its Commandant is a constituent of mine. General Shoup carries on and advances a great tradition, a tradition to which all Americans can point with pride.

This is just part of the reason why I was so delighted with a new short motion picture. It is called "A Force in Readiness." This film was produced without cost to the Government.

It is thrilling as it graphically and dramatically demonstrates the readiness of the Navy-Marine Corps team to act if the safety of our country is threatened. This outstanding motion picture portrays this team not just as a fist ready for use in case fighting is called for, but also as a positive power for peace.

"A Force in Readiness" reflects extreme devotion to America and all this blessed land stands for. It shows both

our devotion to the cause of peace and our determination to fight to maintain our ideals, our American way of life. It shows the way to preservation of liberty through peace, but through fighting if need be.

I commend all those who had a part in the production of this unusual film epic. Especially deserving of praise are: Jack L. Warner, president of Warner Bros., who put all the facilities of his company behind the making of "A Force in Readiness," following long-standing patriotic practices of this company; Jack Webb, the narrator; William L. Hendricks, who wrote and produced the picture; J. Russell Graziano, supervising film editor; Larry Glickman, who provided technical work and titles; the American Federation of Musicians, and all others who participated in the production.

I recommend this film, "A Force in Readiness," to all Americans. I compliment the Marine Corps and General Shoup for providing the service and reassurance to our Nation that the motion picture represents.

#### EARTH ORBITING OF LT. COL. JOHN H. GLENN, JR.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, the Nation today is grateful and proud of the courage and technical excellence displayed by Lt. Col. John H. Glenn, Jr., in accomplishing America's first manned orbit of the earth.

His skill has gone a long way toward restoring the world's faith in American leadership and science. While it is an enormous advance for the astronauts, it is also a significant milestone for the Federal Space Agency and American industry.

The history that was written Tuesday will serve as an inspiration to our scientists and to future astronauts, who will take space vehicles of the United States to even more phenomenal heights and perhaps to distant planets.

The Space Agency and Lieutenant Colonel Glenn have earned the gratitude and admiration of the Nation and, indeed, the world.

This generation and future generations of American astronauts will write even more spectacular chapters in the space history. But I do not think we will ever forget this breakthrough that has been achieved by Lieutenant Colonel Glenn, which because of our open society was dramatically witnessed by all the people of the earth.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If there is no further morning business, morning business is closed.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### READING OF WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the order previously entered, the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] will now proceed to the rostrum, to read the Farewell Address of the first President of the United States.

Mr. RANDOLPH advanced to the desk, and read the Farewell Address, as follows:

*To the People of the United States:*

FRIENDS AND FELLOW CITIZENS: The period for a new election of a citizen to administer the executive government of the United States being not far distant, and the time actually arrived when your thoughts must be employed in designating the person who is to be clothed with that important trust, it appears to me proper, especially as it may conduce to a more distinct expression of the public voice, that I should now apprise you of the resolution I have formed, to decline being considered among the number of those, out of whom a choice is to be made.

I beg you, at the same time, to do me the justice to be assured, that this resolution has not been taken, without a strict regard to all the considerations appertaining to the relation which binds a dutiful citizen to his country; and that, in withdrawing the tender of service which silence in my situation might imply, I am influenced by no diminution of zeal for your future interest; no deficiency of grateful respect for your past kindness; but am supported by a full conviction that the step is compatible with both.

The acceptance of, and continuance hitherto in the office to which your suffrages have twice called me, have been a uniform sacrifice of inclination to the opinion of duty, and to a deference for what appeared to be your desire. I constantly hoped that it would have been much earlier in my power, consistently with motives which I was not at liberty to disregard, to return to that retirement from which I had been reluctantly drawn. The strength of my inclination to do this, previous to the last election, had even led to the preparation of an address to declare it to you; but mature reflection on the then perplexed and critical posture of our affairs with foreign nations, and the unanimous advice of persons entitled to my confidence, impelled me to abandon the idea.

I rejoice that the state of your concerns, external as well as internal, no longer renders the pursuit of inclination incompatible with the sentiment of duty or propriety; and am persuaded, whatever partiality may be retained for my services, that in the present circumstances of our country, you will not disapprove my determination to retire.

The impressions with which I first undertook the arduous trust, were explained on the proper occasion. In the discharge of this trust, I will only say that I have, with good intentions, contributed towards the organization and administration of the government, the best exertions of which a very fallible judgment was capable. Not unconscious

in the outset, of the inferiority of my qualifications, experience, in my own eyes, perhaps still more in the eyes of others, has strengthened the motives to diffidence of myself; and, every day, the increasing weight of years admonishes me more and more, that the shade of retirement is as necessary to me as it will be welcome. Satisfied that if any circumstances have given peculiar value to my services they were temporary, I have the consolation to believe that, while choice and prudence invite me to quit the political scene, patriotism does not forbid it.

In looking forward to the moment which is to terminate the career of my political life, my feelings do not permit me to suspend the deep acknowledgment of that debt of gratitude which I owe to my beloved country, for the many honors it has conferred upon me; still more for the steadfast confidence with which it has supported me; and for the opportunities I have thence enjoyed of manifesting my inviolable attachment, by services faithful and persevering, though in usefulness unequal to my zeal. If benefits have resulted to our country from these services, let it always be remembered to your praise, and as an instructive example in our annals, that under circumstances in which the passions, agitated in every direction, were liable to mislead amidst appearances sometimes dubious, vicissitudes of fortune often discouraging—in situations in which not unfrequently want of success has countenanced the spirit of criticism, the constancy of your support was the essential prop of the efforts, and a guarantee of the plans, by which they were effected. Profoundly penetrated with this idea, I shall carry it with me to my grave, as a strong incitement to unceasing vows that heaven may continue to you the choicest tokens of its beneficence—that your union and brotherly affection may be perpetual—that the free constitution, which is the work of your hands, may be sacredly maintained—that its administration in every department may be stamped with wisdom and virtue—that, in fine, the happiness of the people of these states, under the auspices of liberty, may be made complete by so careful a preservation, and so prudent a use of this blessing, as will acquire to them the glory of recommending it to the applause, the affection and adoption of every nation which is yet a stranger to it.

Here, perhaps, I ought to stop. But a solicitude for your welfare, which cannot end but with my life, and the apprehension of danger, natural to that solicitude, urge me, on an occasion like the present, to offer to your solemn contemplation, and to recommend to your frequent review, some sentiments which are the result of much reflection, of no inconsiderable observation, and which appear to me all important to the permanency of your felicity as a people. These will be offered to you with the more freedom, as you can only see in them the disinterested warnings of a parting friend, who can possibly have no personal motive to bias his counsel. Nor can I forget, as an encouragement to it, your indulgent recep-

tion of my sentiments on a former and not dissimilar occasion.

Interwoven as is the love of liberty with every ligament of your hearts, no recommendation of mine is necessary to fortify or confirm the attachment.

The unity of government which constitutes you one people, is also now dear to you. It is justly so; for it is a main pillar in the edifice of your real independence; the support of your tranquillity at home; your peace abroad; of your safety; of your prosperity; of that very liberty which you so highly prize. But as it is easy to foresee that, from different causes and from different quarters much pains will be taken, many artifices employed, to weaken in your minds the conviction of this truth, as this is the point in your political fortress against which the batteries of internal and external enemies will be most constantly and actively (though often covertly and insidiously) directed; it is of infinite moment, that you should properly estimate the immense value of your national union to your collective and individual happiness; that you should cherish a cordial, habitual, and immovable attachment to it; accustoming yourselves to think and speak of it as the palladium of your political safety and prosperity; watching for its preservation with jealous anxiety; discountenancing whatever may suggest even a suspicion that it can, in any event, be abandoned; and indignantly frowning upon the first dawning of every attempt to alienate any portion of our country from the rest, or to enfeeble the sacred ties which now link together the various parts.

For this you have every inducement of sympathy and interest. Citizens by birth, or choice, of a common country, that country has a right to concentrate your affections. The name of American, which belongs to you in your national capacity, must always exalt the just pride of patriotism, more than any appellation derived from local discriminations. With slight shades of difference, you have the same religion, manners, habits, and political principles. You have, in a common cause, fought and triumphed together; the independence and liberty you possess, are the work of joint counsels, and joint efforts, of common dangers, suffering and successes.

But these considerations, however powerfully they addressed themselves to your sensibility, are greatly outweighed by those which apply more immediately to your interest.—Here, every portion of our country finds the most commanding motives for carefully guarding and preserving the union of the whole.

The *north*, in an unrestrained intercourse with the *south*, protected by the equal laws of a common government, finds in the productions of the latter, great additional resources of maritime and commercial enterprise, and precious materials of manufacturing industry.—The *south* in the same intercourse, benefiting by the same agency of the *north*, sees its agriculture grow and its commerce expand. Turning partly into its own channels the seamen of the *north*, it finds its particular navigation invigorated; and while it contributes, in differ-

ent ways, to nourish and increase the general mass of the national navigation, it looks forward to the protection of a maritime strength, to which itself is unequally adapted. The *east*, in a like intercourse with the *west*, already finds, and in the progressive improvement of interior communications by land and water, will more and more find a valuable vent for the commodities which it brings from abroad, or manufactures at home. The *west* derives from the *east* supplies requisite to its growth and comfort—and what is perhaps of still greater consequence, it must of necessity owe the secure enjoyments of indispensable outlets for its own productions, to the weight, influence, and the future maritime strength of the Atlantic side of the Union, directed by an indissoluble community of interest as *one nation*. Any other tenure by which the *west* can hold this essential advantage, whether derived from its own separate strength; or from an apostate and unnatural connection with any foreign power, must be intrinsically precarious.

While then every part of our country thus feels an immediate and particular interest in union, all the parts combined cannot fail to find in the united mass of means and efforts, greater strength, greater resource, proportionably greater security from external danger, a less frequent interruption of their peace by foreign nations; and, what is of inestimable value, they must derive from union, an exemption from those broils and wars between themselves, which so frequently afflict neighboring countries not tied together by the same government; which their own rivalry alone would be sufficient to produce, but which opposite foreign alliances, attachments, and intrigues, would stimulate and embitter. Hence likewise, they will avoid the necessity of those overgrown military establishments, which under any form of government are inauspicious to liberty, and which are to be regarded as particularly hostile to republican liberty. In this sense it is, that your union ought to be considered as a main prop of your liberty, and that the love of the one ought to endeavor to you the preservation of the other.

These considerations speak a persuasive language to every reflecting and virtuous mind and exhibit the continuance of the union as a primary object of patriotic desire. Is there a doubt whether a common government can embrace so large a sphere? let experience solve it. To listen to mere speculation in such a case were criminal. We are authorized to hope that a proper organization of the whole, with the auxiliary agency of governments for the respective subdivisions, will afford a happy issue to the experiment. It is well worth a fair and full experiment. With such powerful and obvious motives to union, affecting all parts of our country, while experience shall not have demonstrated its impracticability, there will always be reason to distrust the patriotism of those who, in any quarter, may endeavor to weaken its hands.

In contemplating the causes which may disturb our Union, it occurs as mat-

ter of serious concern, that any ground should have been furnished for characterizing parties by *geographical* discriminations,—*northern* and *southern*—*Atlantic* and *western*; whence designing men may endeavor to excite a belief that there is a real difference of local interests and views. One of the expedients of party to acquire influence within particular districts, is to misrepresent the opinions and aims of other districts. You cannot shield yourselves too much against the jealousies and heart burnings which spring from these misrepresentations; they tend to render alien to each other those who ought to be bound together by fraternal affection. The inhabitants of our western country have lately had a useful lesson on this head; they have seen, in the negotiation by the executive, and in the unanimous ratification by the senate of the treaty with Spain, and in the universal satisfaction at the event throughout the United States, a decisive proof how unfounded were the suspicions propagated among them of a policy in the general government and in the Atlantic states, unfriendly to their interests in regard to the Mississippi. They have been witnesses to the formation of two treaties, that with Great Britain and that with Spain, which secure to them everything they could desire, in respect to our foreign relations, towards confirming their prosperity. Will it not be their wisdom to rely for the preservation of these advantages on the union by which they were procured? will they not henceforth be deaf to those advisers, if such they are, who would sever them from their brethren and connect them with aliens?

To the efficacy and permanency of your Union, a government for the whole is indispensable. No alliance, however strict, between the parts can be an adequate substitute; they must inevitably experience the infractions and interruptions which all alliances, in all times, have experienced. Sensible of this momentous truth, you have improved upon your first essay, by the adoption of a constitution of government, better calculated than your former, for an intimate union, and for the efficacious management of your common concerns. This government, the offspring of our own choice, uninfluenced and unawed, adopted upon full investigation and mature deliberation, completely free in its principles, in the distribution of its powers, uniting security with energy, and maintaining within itself a provision for its own amendment, has a just claim to your confidence and your support. Respect for its authority, compliance with its laws, acquiescence in its measures, are duties enjoined by the fundamental maxims of true liberty. The basis of our political systems is the right of the people to make and to alter their constitutions of government.—But the constitution which at any time exists, until changed by an explicit and authentic act of the whole people, is sacredly obligatory upon all. The very idea of the power and the right of the people to establish government, presupposes the duty of every individual to obey the established government.

All obstructions to the execution of the laws, all combinations and associations, under whatever plausible character, with the real design to direct, control, counteract, or awe the regular deliberations and action of the constituted authorities, are destructive of this fundamental principle, and of fatal tendency.—They serve to organize faction, to give it an artificial and extraordinary force, to put in the place of the delegated will of the nation the will of party, often a small but artful and enterprising minority of the community; and according to the alternate triumphs of different parties, to make the public administration the mirror of the ill concerted and incongruous projects of faction, rather than the organ of consistent and wholesome plans digested by common councils, and modified by mutual interests.

However combinations or associations of the above description may now and then answer popular ends, they are likely, in the course of time and things, to become potent engines, by which cunning, ambitious, and unprincipled men, will be enabled to subvert the power of the people, and to usurp for themselves the reins of government; destroying afterwards the very engines which have lifted them to unjust dominion.

Towards the preservation of your government and the permanency of your present happy state it is requisite, not only, that you steadily discountenance irregular opposition to its acknowledged authority, but also that you resist with care the spirit of innovation upon its principles, however specious the pretext. One method of assault may be to effect, in the forms of the constitution, alterations which will impair the energy of the system; and thus to undermine what cannot be directly overthrown. In all the changes to which you may be involved, remember that time and habit are at least as necessary to fix the true character of governments, as of other human institutions:—that experience is the surest standard by which to test the real tendency of the existing constitution of a country:—that facility in changes, upon the credit of mere hypothesis and opinion, exposes to perpetual change from the endless variety of hypothesis and opinion; and remember, especially, that for the efficient management of your common interests in a country so extensive as ours, a government of as much vigor as is consistent with the perfect security of liberty is indispensable. Liberty itself will find in such a government with powers properly distributed and adjusted, its surest guardian. It is, indeed, little else than a name, where the government is too feeble to withstand the enterprises of faction, to confine each member of the society within the limits prescribed by the laws, and to maintain all in the secure and tranquil enjoyment of the rights of person and property.

I have already intimated to you the danger of parties in the state, with particular references to the founding of them on geographical discrimination. Let me now take a more comprehensive view, and warn you in the most solemn manner against the baneful effects of the spirit of party generally.

This spirit, unfortunately, is inseparable from our nature, having its root in the strongest passions of the human mind.—It exists under different shapes in all governments, more or less stifled, controlled, or repressed; but in those of the popular form it is seen in its greatest rankness, and is truly their worst enemy.

The alternate domination of one faction over another, sharpened by the spirit of revenge natural to party dissension, which in different ages and countries has perpetrated the most horrid enormities, is itself a frightful despotism. But this leads at length to a more formal and permanent despotism. The disorders and miseries which result, gradually incline the minds of men to seek security and repose in the absolute power of an individual; and, sooner or later, the chief of some prevailing faction, more able or more fortunate than his competitors, turns this disposition to the purpose of his own elevation on the ruins of public liberty.

Without looking forward to an extremity of this kind (which nevertheless ought not to be entirely out of sight) the common and continual mischiefs of the spirit or party are sufficient to make it the interest and duty of a wise people to discourage and restrain it.

It serves always to distract the public councils, and enfeeble the public administration. It agitates the community with ill founded jealousies and false alarms; kindles the animosity of one part against another; foment occasional riot and insurrection. It opens the door to foreign influence and corruption, which finds a facilitated access to the government itself through the channels of party passions. Thus the policy and the will of one country are subjected to the policy and will of another.

There is an opinion that parties in free countries are useful checks upon the administration of the government, and serve to keep alive the spirit of liberty. This within certain limits is probably true; and in governments of a monarchical cast, patriotism may look with indulgence, if not with favor, upon the spirit of party. But in those of the popular character, in governments purely elective, it is a spirit not to be encouraged. From their natural tendency, it is certain there will always be enough of that spirit for every salutary purpose. And there being constant danger of excess, the effort ought to be, by force of public opinion, to mitigate and assuage it. A fire not to be quenched, it demands a uniform vigilance to prevent it bursting into a flame, lest instead of warming, it should consume.

It is important likewise, that the habits of thinking in a free country should inspire caution in those intrusted with its administration, to confine themselves within their respective constitutional spheres, avoiding in the exercise of the powers of one department, to encroach upon another. The spirit of encroachment tends to consolidate the powers of all the departments in one, and thus to create, whatever the form of government, a real despotism. A just estimate of that love of power and proneness to abuse it which predominate in the human heart, is sufficient to satisfy us of the truth of

this position. The necessity of reciprocal checks in the exercise of political power, by dividing and distributing it into different depositories, and constituting each the guardian of the public weal against invasion of the others, has been evinced by experiments ancient and modern; some of them in our country and under our own eyes.—To preserve them must be as necessary as to institute them. If, in the opinion of the people, the distribution or modification of the constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way which the constitution designates.—But let there be no change by usurpation; for though this, in one instance, may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed. The precedent must always greatly overbalance in permanent evil any partial or transient benefit which the use can at any time yield.

Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports. In vain would that man claim the tribute of patriotism, who should labor to subvert these great pillars of human happiness, these firmest props of the duties of men and citizens. The mere politician, equally with the pious man, ought to respect and to cherish them. A volume could not trace all their connections with private and public felicity. Let it simply be asked, Where is the security for property, for reputation, for life, if the sense of religious obligation desert the oaths which are the instruments of investigation in courts of justice? And let us with caution indulge the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion. Whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds of peculiar structure, reason and experience both forbid us to expect, that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle.

It is substantially true, that virtue or morality is a necessary spring of popular government. The rule, indeed, extends with more or less force to every species of free government. Who that is a sincere friend to it can look with indifference upon attempts to shake the foundation of the fabric?

Promote, then, as an object of primary importance, institutions for the general diffusion of knowledge. In proportion as the structure of a government gives force to public opinion, it should be enlightened.

As a very important source of strength and security, cherish public credit. One method of preserving it is to use it as sparingly as possible, avoiding occasions of expense by cultivating peace, but remembering, also, that timely disbursements, to prepare for danger, frequently prevent much greater disbursements to repel it; avoiding likewise the accumulation of debt, not only by shunning occasions of expense, but by vigorous exertions, in time of peace, to discharge the debts which unavoidable wars may have occasioned, not ungenerously throwing upon posterity the burden which we ourselves ought to bear. The execution of these maxims belongs to your representatives, but it is necessary that public

opinions should cooperate. To facilitate to them the performance of their duty, it is essential that you should practically bear in mind, that towards the payment of debts there must be revenue; that to have revenue there must be taxes, that no taxes can be devised which are not more or less inconvenient and unpleasant; that the intrinsic embarrassment inseparable from the selection of the proper object (which is always a choice of difficulties), ought to be a decisive motive for a candid construction of the conduct of the government in making it, and for a spirit of acquiescence in the measures for obtaining revenue, which the public exigencies may at any time dictate.

Observe good faith and justice towards all nations; cultivate peace and harmony with all. Religion and morality enjoin this conduct, and can it be that good policy does not equally enjoin it? It will be worthy of a free, enlightened, and, at no distant period, a great nation, to give to mankind the magnanimous and too novel example of a people always guided by an exalted justice and benevolence. Who can doubt but, in the course of time and things, the fruits of such a plan would richly repay any temporary advantages which might be lost by a steady adherence to it; can it be that Providence has not connected the permanent felicity of a nation with its virtue? The experiment, at least is recommended by every sentiment which ennobles human nature. Alas! is it rendered impossible by its vices?

In the execution of such a plan, nothing is more essential than that permanent, inveterate antipathies against particular nations and passionate attachments for others, should be excluded; and that in place of them, just and amicable feelings towards all should be cultivated. The nation which indulges towards another an habitual hatred, or an habitual fondness, is in some degree a slave. It is a slave to its animosity or to its affection, either of which is sufficient to lead it astray from its duty and its interest. Antipathy in one nation against another disposes each more readily to offer insult and injury, to lay hold of slight causes of umbrage, and to be haughty and intractable when accidental or trifling occasions of dispute occur. Hence, frequent collisions, obstinate, envenomed, and bloody contests. The nation, prompted by ill will and resentment, sometimes impels to war the government, contrary to the best calculations of policy. The government sometimes participates in the national propensity, and adopts through passion what reason would reject; at other times, it makes the animosity of the nation subservient to projects of hostility, instigated by pride, ambition, and other sinister and pernicious motives. The peace often, sometimes perhaps the liberty of nations, has been the victim.

So likewise, a passionate attachment of one nation for another produces a variety of evils. Sympathy for the favorite nation, facilitating the illusion of an imaginary common interest in cases where no real common interest exists, and infusing into one the enmities of the other, betrays the former into a par-

ticipation in the quarrels and wars of the latter, without adequate inducements or justifications. It leads also to concessions, to the favorite nation, of privileges denied to others, which is apt doubly to injure the nation making the concessions, by unnecessary parting with what ought to have been retained, and by exciting jealousy, ill will, and a disposition to retaliate in the parties from whom equal privileges are withheld; and it gives to ambitious, corrupted or deluded citizens who devote themselves to the favorite nation, facility to betray or sacrifice the interests of their own country, without odium, sometimes even with popularity; gilding with the appearances of a virtuous sense of obligation, a commendable deference for public opinion, or a laudable zeal for public good, the base or foolish compliances of ambition, corruption, or infatuation.

As avenues to foreign influence in innumerable ways, such attachments are particularly alarming to the truly enlightened and independent patriot. How many opportunities do they afford to tamper with domestic factions, to practice the arts of seduction, to mislead public opinion, to influence or awe the public councils!—Such an attachment of a small or weak, towards a great and powerful nation, dooms the former to be the satellite of the latter.

Against the insidious wiles of foreign influence (I conjure you to believe me fellow citizens) the jealousy of a free people ought to be constantly awake; since history and experience prove, that foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of republican government. But that jealousy, to be useful, must be impartial, else it becomes the instrument of the very influence to be avoided, instead of a defense against it. Excessive partiality for one foreign nation and excessive dislike for another, cause those whom they actuate to see danger only on one side, and serve to veil and even second the arts of influence on the other. Real patriots, who may resist the intrigues of the favorite, are liable to become suspected and odious; while its tools and dupes usurp the applause and confidence of the people, to surrender their interest.

The great rule of conduct for us, in regard to foreign nations, is, in extending our commercial relations, to have with them as little political connection as possible. So far as we have already formed engagements, let them be fulfilled with perfect good faith:—Here let us stop.

Europe has a set of primary interests, which to us have none, or a very remote relation. Hence, she must be engaged in frequent controversies, the causes of which are essentially foreign to our concerns. Hence, therefore, it must be unwise in us to implicate ourselves, by artificial ties, in the ordinary vicissitudes of her politics, or the ordinary combinations and collusions of her friendships or enmities.

Our detached and distant situation invites and enables us to pursue a different course. If we remain one people, under an efficient government, the period is not far off when we may defy material

injury from external annoyance; when we may take such an attitude as will cause the neutrality we may at any time resolve upon, to be scrupulously respected; when belligerent nations, under the impossibility of making acquisitions upon us, will not lightly hazard the giving us provocation, when we may choose peace or war, as our interest, guided by justice, shall counsel.

Why forego the advantages of so peculiar a situation? Why quit our own to stand upon foreign ground? Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalry, interest, humor, or caprice?

It is our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliance with any portion of the foreign world; so far, I mean, as we are now at liberty to do it; for let me not be understood as capable of patronizing infidelity to existing engagements. I hold the maxim no less applicable to public than private affairs, that honesty is always the best policy. I repeat it, therefore, let those engagements be observed in their genuine sense. But in my opinion, it is unnecessary, and would be unwise to extend them.

Taking care always to keep ourselves by suitable establishments, on a respectable defensive posture, we may safely trust to temporary alliances for extraordinary emergencies.

Harmony, and a liberal intercourse with all nations, are recommended by policy, humanity, and interest. But even our commercial policy should hold an equal and impartial hand; neither seeking nor granting exclusive favors or preferences; consulting the natural course of things; diffusing and diversifying by gentle means the streams of commerce, but forcing nothing; establishing with powers so disposed, in order to give trade a stable course, to define the rights of our merchants, and to enable the government to support them, conventional rules of intercourse, the best that present circumstances and mutual opinion will permit, but temporary, and liable to be from time to time abandoned or varied as experience and circumstances shall dictate; constantly keeping in view, that it is folly in one nation to look for disinterested favors from another; that it must pay with a portion of its independence for whatever it may accept under that character; that by such acceptance, it may place itself in the condition of having given equivalents for nominal favors, and yet of being reproached with ingratitude for not giving more. There can be no greater error than to expect, or calculate upon real favors from nation to nation. It is an illusion which experience must cure, which a just pride ought to discard.

In offering to you, my countrymen, these counsels of an old and affectionate friend, I dare not hope they will make the strong and lasting impression I could wish; that they will control the usual current of the passions, or prevent our nation from running the course which has hitherto marked the destiny of nations, but if I may even flatter myself that they may be productive of some partial benefit, some occasional

good; that they may now and then recur to moderate the fury of party spirit, to warn against the mischiefs of foreign intrigue, to guard against the impostures of pretended patriotism; this hope will be a full recompense for the solicitude for your welfare by which they have been dictated.

How far, in the discharge of my official duties, I have been guided by the principles which have been delineated, the public records and other evidences of my conduct must witness to you and to the world. To myself, the assurance of my own conscience is, that I have, at least, believed myself to be guided by them.

In relation to the still subsisting war in Europe; my proclamation of the 22d of April, 1793, is the index to my plan. Sanctioned by your approving voice, and by that of your representatives in both houses of congress, the spirit of that measure has continually governed me, uninfluenced by any attempts to deter or divert me from it.

After deliberate examination, with the aid of the best lights I could obtain, I was well satisfied that our country, under all the circumstances of the case, had a right to take, and was bound in duty and interest, to take a neutral position. Having taken it, I determined, as far as should depend upon me, to maintain it with moderation, perseverance and firmness.

The considerations which respect the right to hold this conduct, it is not necessary on this occasion to detail. I will only observe that, according to my understanding of the matter, that right, so far from being denied by any of the belligerent powers, has been virtually admitted by all.

The duty of holding a neutral conduct may be inferred, without anything more, from the obligation which justice and humanity impose on every nation, in cases in which it is free to act, to maintain inviolate the relations of peace and amity towards other nations.

The inducements of interest for observing that conduct will best be referred to your own reflections and experience. With me a predominant motive has been to endeavor to gain time to our country to settle and mature its yet recent institutions, and to progress, without interruption, to that degree of strength, and consistency which is necessary to give it, humanly speaking, the command of its own fortunes.

Though in reviewing the incidents of my administration, I am unconscious of intentional error, I am nevertheless too sensible of my defects not to think it probable that I may have committed many errors. Whatever they may be, I fervently beseech the Almighty to avert or mitigate the evils to which they may tend. I shall also carry with me the hope that my country will never cease to view them with indulgence; and that, after forty-five years of my life dedicated to its service, with an upright zeal, the faults of incompetent abilities will be consigned to oblivion, as myself must soon be to the mansions of rest.

Relying on its kindness in this as in other things, and actuated by that fervent love towards it, which is so natural

to a man who views in it the native soil of himself and his progenitors for several generations; I anticipate with pleasing expectation that retreat in which I promise myself to realize without alloy, the sweet enjoyment of partaking, in the midst of my fellow citizens, the benign influence of good laws under a free government—the ever favorite object of my heart, and the happy reward, as I trust, of our mutual cares, labors and dangers.

GEO. WASHINGTON.

UNITED STATES,  
17th September, 1796.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I take this occasion to commend the distinguished Senator from West Virginia for his excellent and outstanding rendition of Washington's Farewell Address to the people of the United States. I think it is appropriate at this time to recall that during the darkest hours of the American Revolution, the Father of our Country said:

Give me but a banner to plant upon the hills of West Augusta—

Which, if I may interpolate, is now the State of West Virginia—

and I shall gather around me those men who will set this bleeding Nation free.

George Washington was a surveyor in that lovely area, and he spent much of his time in what is now the State of West Virginia. He said that midst its green and quiet hills there was to be found the very essence of freedom itself. I think it is a fitting coincidence that the distinguished and able Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] should have given us today the magnificent words of the first President, in view of the historical association which George Washington had with what is now West Virginia. I am sure that I express the sense of the Senate when I thank the distinguished Senator from West Virginia for his rendition today.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I join with the majority leader in paying tribute to the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] for his reading of George Washington's Farewell Address. I know that the manner in which the Senator from West Virginia has done so has brought to all of us a deeper appreciation of the truth and values of that address. His rendition reminded me what a great intellect fathered our country, and that perhaps in this latter time we have tended to confuse great intellectual ability with mere mental acrobatics or gymnastics. There is a great difference. I only wish that hundreds more could have heard the rendition given by the distinguished Senator from West Virginia this noon.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I join the distinguished majority leader in commending the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] for his able rendition of President George Washington's Farewell Address. I wish to point out an incident in the life of George Washington that has sometimes been overlooked.

This morning television reminded us of an incident in the life of George Washington. When the Continental

Army was disbanded and the soldiers were going home, we had a weak, inefficient, bankrupt, and almost no, government. When it came time to sign the more than 10,000 discharges, the staff of George Washington recommended that he delegate the duty of signing the discharges to the general of each division. The staff pointed out that George Washington's signature was long and it would be a laborious task to sign that number of discharges.

President George Washington said:

No, I want every soldier in the American Army to have a discharge signed by me, because I want him to know that I saw his name and appreciate his service in the revolution.

So the discharge of every revolutionary soldier, not only the 10,000, but others, bore the personal signature of President George Washington. That is one little incident in Washington's great devotion to duty.

This morning the distinguished Senator from West Virginia read the address of President George Washington with much feeling, understanding, and meaning, and not as a mere matter of rote. I commend him for the thought that he has given to the great words of admonition from our greatest American.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I am glad that we are today observing the birthday anniversary of George Washington and that we have had an opportunity to listen to the rendition of the Farewell Address by the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH].

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I, too, wish to add my commendation to those of my colleagues for the excellent rendition of the Farewell Address by the able senior Senator from West Virginia.

I could not help noticing during the course of the Farewell Address that portion which relates to public credit:

One method of preserving it is to use it as sparingly as possible, avoiding occasions of expense by cultivating peace, but remembering, also, that timely disbursements, to prepare for danger, frequently prevent much greater disbursements to repel it; avoiding likewise the accumulation of debt, not only by shunning occasions of expense, but by vigorous exertions, in time of peace, to discharge the debts which unavoidable wars may have occasioned, not ungenerously throwing upon posterity the burden which we ourselves ought to bear.

I wish that more Members of Congress down through the years, including present Members of Congress, had heeded these words, because I read with great concern an article entitled "Uncle Sam Faces \$1 Trillion Debt," written by Maurice H. Stans, and published in the February 19, 1962, issue of the Washington Post.

I ask unanimous consent that the article may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR CHANGING ECONOMY—UNCLE SAM FACES  
\$1 TRILLION DEBT

(By Maurice H. Stans)

Treasury Secretary C. Douglas Dillon has asked for a \$10 billion increase in the ceiling

on our national debt. This would bring it to an all-time high of \$308 billion.

The Congress has indicated that it will deal with this request in two installments. An increase of \$2 billion will undoubtedly be authorized immediately, as an emergency measure, to permit enough new funding to pay current bills. This will bring the debt total to the magic line of \$300 billion.

Above this amount, Dillon will have tougher sailing, and the Congress may give him only a part of the additional \$8 billion he wants. Senator HARRY F. BYRD, Democrat, of Virginia, long-time champion of solvent government, has announced that his Senate Finance Committee will hold hearings on the state of the Government's financial position before voting any further increases. By the time the hearings are concluded, the Senator will have some shocking news to report to the American people.

#### INTEREST IS \$9 BILLION

The annual interest on the national debt is now running above \$9 billion, and for the last several years this carrying cost, without any payment on the debt itself, has been taking 11 cents of every dollar of Federal taxes collected. And the chances that any of this debt will ever be paid off seem less and less as time goes on.

This is quite a contrast with the past. From the beginning of the Nation in 1789 until recent years, a major objective of every President was to pay off the national debt. It was done once—by Andrew Jackson in 1834. But each succeeding war built the debt to a new plateau; intervening efforts accomplished reductions but never eliminated the entire amount.

Even so, at the end of fiscal 1916, the debt was only a little more than a billion dollars. By the end of World War I, it had soared above \$25 billion. From this high point it was reduced in 11 consecutive years, cutting it by more than one-third to \$16 billion in 1930.

From there it began an upward climb, through wartime and peacetime, with the budget in the red 26 years out of 32. The depression years increased the debt regularly, and it had reached nearly \$50 billion before the outbreak of World War II. At the close of the war it was \$270 billion. Three subsequent surpluses by Truman and three more by Eisenhower could not match the costs of the Korean war and the intervening peacetime deficits. The current year's spending will push the debt to \$300 billion, or more, and the end is not in sight.

#### CREDIT CARD GOVERNMENT

Up to now I have been referring only to the interest-bearing debt. But this isn't all that we owe as a nation. By a continuing policy of national extravagance, we have been committing the Government's future resources beyond this to an incredible degree. We have adopted in Washington a program of "credit-card Government" that is placing a burden of staggering proportions on our children and grandchildren.

As Director of the Budget, I undertook in 1960 to add up all the liabilities of our Government. Here are some of them. We owe \$30 billion in unfunded pensions to retired civilian employees of the Government. We owe almost \$40 billion in accrued pensions to retired military servicemen. The total of our present commitments to veterans for future pensions and compensation (not counting many other benefits) is in excess of \$300 billion. All of this \$370 billion is for past services and in the financial statement of a business would be accounted for among liabilities.

Then there are many other present contractual or legislated Government undertakings that will have to be financed in the future. Taking all of them—housing subsidy contracts, shipping subsidies, the Interstate Highway System, unfinished public

works projects, unpaid purchases of military supplies and many others—this group adds up to more than \$150 billion in further bills to be met in the coming years.

#### SOCIAL SECURITY, TOO

Altogether, counting the interest-bearing debt of \$300 billion and the other obligations and commitments I have mentioned, we have placed a mortgage of over \$800 billion on our national future to be met in taxes. This does not include untold billions of dollars in guarantees by the Government on housing loans and other mortgages, bank deposits and other savings, and so on.

Even this is not the full story. Under our social security system, we have scheduled a series of benefits that far exceed, in actuarial terms, the resources that would be available at present tax rates. This deficiency, which can only be made up out of future tax increases already provided in the law, is another \$250 or \$300 billion.

This makes the total present undertakings of the Government, to be paid from future taxes, in excess of a trillion dollars. And that is beyond the regular annual costs of defense, welfare, and other Government activities.

This is a national debt of more than \$22,000 for every family of four in the country. Quite a spending spree we've been on for the last 30 years, isn't it?

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, it is not the present generation that will be paying this debt; it will be a burden passed on to posterity, to future generations of this country, and it will be a most ungenerous burden, too.

#### TREATMENT OF ELDERLY CITIZENS

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, recently we have heard that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare has proposed to place all of the old age pension systems in the country upon the same time schedule. My own State has been far reaching and forward looking in the treatment of its elder citizens. The program is one in which I, as well as many other people, have had an active part. It is a program of which I am personally very proud. If the rules were to be relaxed, as the Secretary has suggested, it would cause irreparable damage to the system and the older people in my State. It would be a change that I would not like to see. I am sure that the people of Colorado would not like to see it.

Recently I received a letter from Guy R. Justis, director of the Department of Public Health of the State of Colorado, enclosing a resolution of the Colorado State Board of Public Welfare, urging that Congress take no action which would cause Colorado to lower its residence requirements for recipients of the old-age pension. I ask unanimous consent that the letter, together with the resolution, be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### STATE OF COLORADO, DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WELFARE,

Denver, Colo., February 16, 1962.

Hon. GORDON ALLOTT,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR ALLOTT: Enclosed is a copy of the resolution adopted by the State board

of public welfare at their meeting on Friday, February 9, 1962, urging that the Congress of the United States take no action which would cause Colorado to lower its residence requirements for recipients of old-age pension. This resolution was adopted by unanimous vote of the State board.

At the request of the State board I am forwarding a copy of this resolution to each member of the Colorado congressional delegation. We would appreciate hearing from you what action, if any, is taken by the Congress in this regard.

Sincerely yours,

GUY R. JUSTIS,  
Director.

#### RESOLUTION OF THE COLORADO STATE BOARD OF PUBLIC WELFARE URGING THAT THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TAKE NO ACTION WHICH WOULD CAUSE COLORADO TO LOWER ITS RESIDENCE REQUIREMENTS FOR RECIPIENTS OF OLD-AGE PENSION

Whereas Colorado has, by vote of its citizens, established one of the most adequate pension systems for the aged in the entire United States by providing for a minimum monthly payment of \$100 which has been and may be further increased as the cost of living increases; and

Whereas Colorado in 1958 substantially improved the care for its aged citizens by providing one of the finest medical programs in the Nation; and

Whereas the 5-year residence provision in the present program is a reasonable protection against an influx into Colorado of aged people from other States, particularly adjoining States, with lesser pension programs; and

Whereas to reduce this residence requirement to 1 year would encourage substantial numbers of aged persons from other States to move to Colorado in order to take advantage of the Colorado pension system; and

Whereas the addition of substantial numbers of persons to the present program would substantially reduce the level of medical care now provided under Colorado's pension health and medical care program and cause serious dislocations in the entire program: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the State Board of Public Welfare of the State of Colorado, That the members of this State board of public welfare hereby urge the Congress of the United States to take no action which would lower the residence requirements now in effect for recipients of old-age pension; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Members of Congress of the United States from the State of Colorado.

#### REVIEW COMMISSION URGES BEACH AREA ACQUISITION IN REPORT TO PRESIDENT

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, all of us are aware of the fast-growing need of the people of the United States for recreational space. We are aware also that as the demand grows, the space available for preservation for public use is dwindling. Every day, new developments and new fences rise and the cost of acquisition of land is skyrocketing.

The national need for preservation of recreational areas is an urgent one and no token recognition will be acceptable. The responsibility for the vision and action necessary to provide recreational areas for a growing populace is one that must be dealt with at all governmental levels, for it is a national problem. Each step we take toward preservation of

recreational areas is a national achievement. Each opportunity we miss is a national expense, for some day these recreational areas must be provided and delay merely raises the price.

As the author of the bill (S. 4) to create a national seashore recreational area on 88.5 miles of Padre Island on the Texas gulf coast, I emphasize that the enactment of this measure would be beneficial to people all over Texas and the United States, not only for our time but for all time.

In a discussion of the availability of recreational sites, the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission recently made this statement in a report compiled for the President and the Congress:

A most pressing problem of supply is ocean and Great Lakes shoreline. This resource is one of the most in demand, it is one of the most scarce in public ownership. The situation is particularly acute near large cities.

The 48 contiguous States have almost 60,000 miles of shoreline. About one-third of this can be considered as possible recreation supply. This includes beach, marsh, and bluff areas.

Less than 2 percent of the total shoreline is in public ownership for recreation—only 336 miles on the Atlantic coast and 296 miles on the Pacific coast. Yet both coasts are centers of population, and they will be more so in the future. The present supply of publicly owned shoreline for recreation is not adequate, and acquisition will be needed.

In the same report, the Review Commission made the following recommendation:

Immediate action should be taken by Federal, State, and local governments to acquire additional beach and shoreline areas.

Dan Klepper, in a very able article in the San Antonio News of February 13, said of Padre Island:

Unless necessary steps are taken immediately, the public will lose its right of access and use of this vast and beautiful shoreline.

Next weekend several newspapermen, including myself, will make a trip down the length of this island. We intend to spend 3 or 4 days on the journey.

We will fish in the surf along the way, and we will camp out at night.

While it is relatively easy to negotiate the 110-mile strip of beach in a four-wheel-drive vehicle, we intend to travel on powerful, off-the-road scooters called Tote-Gotes.

We will pack all of our gear, including gasoline, tents, bedrolls, fresh water, and supplies, on the two-wheeled vehicles.

Our purpose in making this trip will be twofold:

1. To test the versatility of these vehicles on hard packed and loose sand. There is a possibility that this type of scooter will be invaluable to saltwater anglers who want to get well off the beaten track.

2. To show our readers what they might expect to find, see, and do if the island beaches are made easily accessible to them, and to show them the work of nature that will be destroyed if a Padre Island Park is not created.

Mr. President, the Congress of the United States should act now, not next year, to preserve Padre Island. There is a race for time. Developers are now putting out multicolored advertisements in trying to excite people with regard to Padre Island, which, unless action is taken soon, will mean that the prices will

be too high for the Government to pay. Mr. President, we are in a race to have this beautiful beach area left as it is now, without any construction on it, for the benefit of all the American people.

To point up the growing national concern over present and future recreational needs in the United States, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the following newspaper articles, entitled "Our First National Seashore—Cape Hatteras: The First American Coastal Area So Designated, Is Attracting More and More Visitors—It Could Happen to Padre," published October 16, 1960, in the Corpus Christi Caller-Times, copyright, 1960, by the Reader's Digest Association, Inc., condensed from Today's Living; "The Outdoorsman: Will Public Lose Padre Beaches," by Dan Klepper, outdoors editor, in the Tuesday, February 13, 1962, edition of the San Antonio News; "Preservation Sought: U.S. Natural Beauty Could Vanish Quickly"; from the Sunday, February 11, 1962, edition of the Corpus Christi Caller-Times; and "Commission Proposes Resources Development," from the February 11, 1962, edition of the Corpus Christi Caller-Times.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Corpus Christi Caller-Times, Oct. 16, 1960]

OUR FIRST NATIONAL SEASHORE—CAPE HATTERAS, THE FIRST AMERICAN COASTAL AREA SO DESIGNATED, IS ATTRACTING MORE AND MORE VISITORS—IT COULD HAPPEN TO PADRE

(By Don Wharton)

Man's desire to stand on the top of some mountain is paralleled by a longing to go down to the edge of the sea. The ocean, from which came life itself, is a magnet pulling us all to the shore. But where our supply of mountains appears inexhaustible, we are now actually running out of seashore for public use.

Huge stretches have become off limits for most people, the way to the shore blocked by no-trespassing signs. In many areas use of beaches is limited to persons stopping at expensive hotels. Too often man has stripped the beach itself of all naturalness by planting it with hotels, cabanas, cabins, and concessions.

Many people have thought it would be wonderful if, somehow, great stretches of shoreline could be set aside permanently for public use and preserved as a seashore wilderness. That is precisely what has been done on the thin, windswept string of barrier islands which form the outer banks of North Carolina.

Here is a stretch of 70 miles of unspoiled beach where you will encounter only shore birds, scurrying crabs, and an occasional surfer; and as you walk against the salty wind, you need not worry about any slick promoter's ruining this shoreline: It is preserved and protected for you and your grandchildren and their grandchildren. For it is Cape Hatteras National Seashore, a new and unique unit in our national park system.

Only 8 years old but already attracting nearly half a million visitors a year, this national seashore was made possible by unusual teamwork between Government and private philanthropy. Congress authorized it in 1937 but voted no funds to acquire land. Sixteen years later, with still no Federal money appropriated, the heirs of Henry Phipps stepped forward and donated 2,700 acres of land at Cape Hatteras itself, the

key tract worth perhaps \$250,000 at the time. The State of North Carolina authorized its Governor to reach into an emergency fund and take out \$618,000—to match \$618,000 offered by the Mellon family. Later, with land speculators jacking up their prices, North Carolina put in an extra \$200,000 and again the Mellons matched it. Thus the Nation acquired a new kind of park: A seashore for everyone for all time.

From the air the narrow islands occupied by the national seashore resemble a wish-bone floating in water. The point of union is at Cape Hatteras, from which one clavicle stretches out 40 miles to the north and the other 30 miles to the southwest. At the cape the bone is nearly 3 miles wide; elsewhere it's generally less than a mile and at some points only a few hundred yards from the ocean to the sound. The whole is one of the Nation's major geographic curiosities. Some scholars believe the outer banks were once much farther out and that over the ages the ocean has driven them ever closer to the mainland. Others disagree, say they were part of the mainland. The rest of us, traveling their length again and again, simply marvel that the narrow ribbon of sand is there at all, beaten as it is by water on both sides and blown ceaselessly by winds and gales.

The Gulf Stream is only 15 miles off the cape. It comes driving up from the south, and here runs head-on into cold currents from the north. The result is treacherous Diamond Shoals, formed offshore for 14 miles. You can stand at the cape and witness one of the world's most dramatic demonstrations of the majesty of the sea. As the two major currents collide you see spectacular spray dashing 20, 30 and more feet into the air. On other shorelines you see sprays from water striking rocks; this spray is simply water striking water.

Most visitors come to the national seashore to spend a day on the long beaches or to camp in tents or trailers for a week or two smack up against the dunes. They come over on free bridges and ferries to bathe in the surf, swim in the sound—and also to waste in history.

The first English colonizing attempt in America was on sandy Roanoke Island, which lies in the sound just back of the outer banks. It was on the outer banks in 1903 that the Wrights made the first successful flights in a powered machine heavier than air. The banks might also be called the birthplace of radio. Reginald A. Fessenden is credited with achieving, in 1902, the first long-distance transmission of the human voice by wireless telephone—i.e., radio. His messages were passed between a 50-foot tower erected just north of the cape and another 52 miles away on Roanoke Island.

In 1923 still another innovator came to the outer banks—Brig. Gen. Billy Mitchell. At the southern tip of the national seashore today you can see the improvised airstrip from which his men took off to sink two old battleships anchored as test targets near Diamond Shoals. In 20 minutes Mitchell's planes changed the whole theory of modern warfare.

In both world wars German submarines haunted the area—one man today tells of climbing the lighthouse at the cape during World War II and seeing four tankers burning simultaneously. This lighthouse is the tallest in the United States, and national seashore visitors are privileged to climb its 268 steps.

But most visitors come to get away from the works of man. On this wilderness shoreline, human effort seems puny compared with the power of wind and sea. The inlet through which the English ships brought our first colonists was closed by drifting sands at least 150 years ago. The wind and sea did this huge engineering job. A few miles south, visitors see a long-abandoned high-

way bridge over dry land—the waters cut an inlet here around 1730, and closed it up 200 years later. The Wrights flew at the base of Kill Devil Hill, a sand dune 90 feet high. But the wind has piled up other dunes here nearly twice that height—and kept them moving, covering live forests in their paths and uncovering dead ones left behind.

The national seashore draws visitors the year around—470,000 last year against 340,000 the year before and 100,000 in 1953. More than half come during the summer, but the other seasons have their attractions, too. More and more people are beginning to recognize the particular charms of an autumn seashore—the sea, the skies, the vegetation, even the sand, take on strange and marvelous colors. Autumn at Hatteras is when fishing is at its best.

In early winter people come to watch the arrival of the greater snow geese—about 10,000 of the 35,000 known population of the fowl feed for weeks on the roots of salt-marsh grasses. Then in late winter commercial fishing begins on the beaches, and many visitors like to watch the men hauling nets in the surf. In spring come bird watchers.

Shouldn't we have more places like this? And shouldn't we secure them before it's too late? Twenty-five years ago the National Park Service made a survey of the Atlantic and gulf coasts, found numbers of unspoiled stretches of seashore and recommended 12 major strips for preservation as national seashores. The Hatteras strip was acquired, but the 11 others were lost; they have long since gone into private and commercial development.

During the past 5 years anonymous donors have provided funds for detailed surveys of all our coasts. In 10,923 miles of shoreline the survey teams found 194 areas which had potentialities for public use and recreation. Twelve of these were recommended by the National Park Service as national seashores: One on the Atlantic coast, five on the Pacific, one on the gulf coast and five along the Great Lakes. Last spring the Secretary of the Interior, with the approval of the President, recommended legislation to set up national seashores at three of these locations: On Cape Cod, on Padre Island off the southernmost coast of Texas and at Oregon Dunes, about halfway between California and Washington.

All three would make marvelous national seashores. They have superlative values that warrant permanent preservation; they are geographically well separated, and they have distinctly different park characteristics. The Cape Cod area has the longest undeveloped sweep of beach in New England—backed by cliffs 150 feet high, a picturesque hinterland and much history. Padre Island, a barrier reef, offers 98 miles of remote subtropical beaches with fascinating birdlife. The Oregon Dunes area includes wide, sandy beaches, the most spectacular sand dunes in North America (450 feet high), and lakes sheltered by dense coniferous forests undergrown with masses of rhododendron.

We should move quickly to set up these three new national seashores, and we should create at least one on the Great Lakes—the Nation's longest shore line. Then—before it is too late—we should plan for still more until our great system of national parks, with their scenic wonders, is matched by an equally great system of national seashores, with their opportunities for public recreation in the inspiring surroundings at the edge of the sea.

[From the San Antonio News, Feb. 13, 1962]

#### WILL PUBLIC LOSE PADRE BEACHES?

(By Dan Klepper)

One of the most pressing problems in providing the American people space for out-

door recreation is the availability of shorelines.

This resource, according to the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, "is one of the most in demand, and it is one of the most scarce in public ownership."

Less than 2 percent of the total shoreline of the United States is in public ownership for recreation.

The Kennedy administration currently is making attempts to develop four shoreline regions into public areas for outdoor recreation.

These are Sleeping Bear Dunes, Mich.; Point Reyes, Calif.; Oregon Dunes, Oreg.; and Padre Island, Tex.

Efforts to establish a large part of Padre Island as a national seashore area have been in the mill for a couple of years.

To date, the attempts have been stymied by land developers and groups wanting to make the area a State park rather than a national area.

Padre Island is a thin strip of sand running approximately 110 miles from the causeway at Flour Bluff to Port Isabel. The island, which is bordered by the gulf on one side and Laguna Madre on the other, varies in width from a few hundred yards to 3 miles.

Padre Island cannot exist in its present state for many more years. Eventually, it will become one of three things: A national seashore area, a State park or a mammoth Miami Beach.

Already the southern tip of the island is being developed in the Miami Beach tradition. There also has been some development on the upper end in the Corpus Christi area.

At present, the army engineers are constructing jetties at Port Mansfield, and the channel for that port will be dredged and maintained to permit shipping. There will be development in that area.

Unless necessary steps are taken immediately, the public will lose its right of access and use of this vast and beautiful shoreline.

Next weekend several newspapermen, including myself, will make a trip down the length of this island. We intend to spend 3 or 4 days on the journey.

We will fish in the surf along the way, and we will camp out at night.

While it is relatively easy to negotiate the 110-mile strip of beach in a four-wheel-drive vehicle, we intend to travel on powerful off-the-road scooters called Tote-Gotes.

We will pack all of our gear, including gasoline, tents, bedrolls, fresh water and supplies, on the two-wheeled vehicles.

Our purpose in making this trip will be twofold:

1. To test the versatility of these vehicles on hard-packed and loose sand. There is a possibility that this type of scooter will be invaluable to saltwater anglers who want to get well off the beaten track.

2. To show our readers what they might expect to find, see and do if the island beaches are made easily accessible to them, and to show them the work of nature that will be destroyed if a Padre Island Park is not created.

[From the Corpus Christi Caller-Times, Feb. 11, 1962]

#### PRESERVATION SOUGHT—U.S. NATURAL BEAUTY COULD VANISH QUICKLY

(By Laurance S. Rockefeller)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—As chairman of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, which has just submitted a report 3 years in the making to President Kennedy and Congress, Laurance S. Rockefeller has devoted considerable thought to the preservation of America's natural heritage. In the following article he examines the basic philosophy of the outdoors and cites the reasons prompt action is necessary.)

During the work of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, the reply given by American GIs to a question often put to them in World War II has come to mind.

"What are you fighting for?" the servicemen were asked.

The answer, most often, hinged on the preservation of the kind of life they had left behind.

Bracketed by that answer is the total of the good life in this country. While sometimes difficult to sort out, the total includes experiences rooted in freedom and the democratic process, love of family and friends, religious expression, and the physical environment—the towns which produced the fighting men and meant so much to them, and the landscape which they either knew intimately or dreamed of getting to know.

#### STILL RICH, BEAUTIFUL

This environment—the vast natural setting for the American scene—is still wondrously rich and beautiful overall despite some shocking treatment. That the Nation presents as bright a face as it does must be counted a marvel, considering the magnitude of past malpractice in the handling of soil, water, forest, grassland, and wildlife.

While our natural heritage is fortunately generous, it has its limits. Our urban and industrial civilization puts special strain on the renewable resources as well as those which once taken from the ground are gone forever. In spite of past experience and new knowledge, it would appear (for instance from the amount of current pollution of air and water) that not all the hard lessons have been taken to heart.

Proper care of the outdoor heritage is inseparable from the central concern of the recommendations proposed by the 15 congressional and citizen member of the Commission: To make available to the American people that quantity and quality of land and water they want and need for recreation, which includes any array of activities vital to their way of life.

#### AN URGENT CALL

Taken together these recommendations are big in purpose and urgent in their call on public and private effort. They could not be otherwise and hope to keep up with the transformation in prospect for this country over the next generation.

What is involved, basically, is the proposition that every citizen is entitled to a share of the good things of this life, and among them are the enjoyment of the Nation's heritage of landscape, lakes, and seashore. Equally important—perhaps even more so—is a conviction that the character of the American people, their spirit, will, and outlook, will be shaped to a large degree in the future as in the past by the nature of their physical surroundings.

It is clearly predictable that these surroundings are going to be subject to greater pressures in the future than in the past.

Barring catastrophe, the basic forces which have changed the natural scene of the United States faster in our lifetime than ever before will continue their momentum at least to the year 2000.

It is noteworthy that more than half of the American people alive today will be around to celebrate the arrival of the next century. Between now and then, the population will increase considerably and the proportion living in metropolitan areas also will rise. People will have more of just about everything that an abundant economy and an astonishing technology can produce—including more leisure time, money, and travel facilities. Combined with the larger population, these last-mentioned factors will generate a demand for outdoor recreation greater than population growth alone would indicate.

In view of these prospects, ways and means of preserving open space reasonably accessible to where most people live are now a necessity, not merely desirable, if the quality of life and man's balance with nature are to be preserved in this country.

#### DEMAND NOT YET MET

It would be difficult to find anyone who is against outdoor recreation. But that is hardly the same as saying we have always been alert to the needs of the people. The great growth in the public's demand for recreation since the end of the Second World War has not been met. The public agencies involved have generally been forced to jam ever more people into the same areas.

Since no government is in the entertainment business, it is necessary to prove the serious values of outdoor recreation, to build a case for public support. What the servicemen said they were fighting for seems to me a powerful argument. Other major items can be cited, and three among them are labeled "physical fitness," the "leisure times problem," and "education."

A direct relationship exists between many kinds of outdoor recreation and physical fitness. The fact that only two of every seven American youths measure up to the current standards of the U.S. Army amounts to a national shame and scandal. The subject has lately started drawing the public attention it merits.

With further reduction of the average workweek virtually certain in the coming decades, this Nation will have the opportunity to realize more fully the great dream of mankind that the individual shall have a rich and rewarding life. This could come to an important degree from constructive use of the growing amount of leisure time.

#### USED IF AVAILABLE

As far as outdoor activities are concerned, there is a connection between participation and the availability of open space and facilities. Westerners go camping to a much greater extent than easterners, apparently, since we are a fairly homogeneous people, because camp sites are more plentiful and easier to reach in the West.

The same condition of availability applies to other outdoor activities—walking, fishing, hunting, swimming, to name a few. The first prerequisite for a stroll in a park is the park.

The days when most American boys and girls could become acquainted with the outdoors, nature, on the walk to school, are gone. Not only have the youngsters in the largest cities been denied this enriching experience, but those in many cities and in most of the new suburbs also have been shut out of nature close to home, except for what they find in the backyard.

#### THE BALANCE OF NATURE

To look across open land, hear a songbird, smell the moss in the woods—these are a necessary beginning to an understanding of the natural forces of the landscape. And man must understand he is one species among many who depend upon each other and upon the natural environment which sustains them all. This is the balance of nature, the ecological system, and our welfare—indeed it is not extreme to say our survival—is inextricably bound up in it.

It takes a department store of outdoor recreation areas to satisfy the 1-day, weekend, and vacation requirements of our people. The matching of the supply of areas with the large, varied demand is an enormous and complicated undertaking. The major problem is to preserve open space reasonably accessible to urban populations, for their enjoyment and benefit.

#### BOTH KINDS NEEDED

To pose the problem, as some do, as a struggle between lovers of unspoiled wilderness and those who want to develop fa-

cilities for masses of people is to straddle the target without hitting it. Both kinds of areas, and others between these extremes, are needed.

Actually, most parks, forest preserves, and other properties devoted entirely or in part to recreation contain two or more kinds of areas or are so endowed by nature that they could. A key purpose of the management agency should be to preserve scenic, natural lands on the one hand and to provide for their use and enjoyment on the other as is done, to cite an example, in Palisades Interstate Park in New Jersey and New York.

It contains beaches, picnic grounds, camping sites, ski runs, and other features, some requiring little and some requiring extensive development. Also in the park—and comprising most of its land area—are primitive stretches in which inconspicuous hiking trails are the only facilities.

#### A WORTHY PURPOSE

The grand purpose of preserving, developing and assuring access to the outdoors is worthy of a nation dedicated to the well-being of its people and properly concerned about its future. This is the tradition of the Frederick Olmsted and Gifford Pinchots of other years, and of many conservationists and park experts of our own. While the scope and direction of the effort may change, the goal is unchanging: To provide for the wants and needs of the people in the outdoors.

[From the Corpus Christi Caller-Times, Feb. 11, 1962]

#### COMMISSION PROPOSES RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT

On January 31 the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, headed by Laurance S. Rockefeller, submitted to President Kennedy and Congress a report called "Outdoor Recreation for America" making more than 50 specific recommendations for action designed to meet outdoor needs of the expanding U.S. population over the next four decades.

The report listed the prospects for growth in population, income, leisure time, travel and other recreation-generating forces. It concluded that a much larger effort in terms of planning and money was needed to guarantee that the benefits of the outdoors will be available to future generations. It also emphasized that changes in management policies governing public and private lands could open up many areas to recreation at relatively little cost without harming other uses of those lands.

The Commission's major proposals included:

Creation of a new bureau of outdoor recreation within the Department of Interior.

Federal grants-in-aid to provide matching funds to States to help them and local communities plan, acquire and develop parks and other outdoor recreation areas.

Immediate action by public agencies to acquire shoreline areas, on the oceans and inland waters.

Federal legislation providing for establishment and management of certain primitive areas as "wilderness areas."

Control of pollution to open up vast amounts of water to swimming and fishing.

#### RECREATIONAL PROPOSALS

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, last September I was numbered among a minority group, comprising Senators from both sides of the aisle, that urged careful consideration and deliberation of the wilderness preservation system, S. 174. At that time I pleaded with this body to not rush into final action on this legislation until the findings of the

Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission were completed and several proposals for recreation and national parks were considered. Our pleas were in vain.

Now, less than 6 months later, with this information available and some of the recreation proposals before us, new concepts and plans in the outdoor recreation field are unfolding. The then current fad for single recreation use of our outdoor areas is giving way to the time-honored multiple-use concept again as is evidenced in the ORRRC report and the debate recently on the establishment of Great Basin National Park in Nevada.

Mr. President, at this point in my remarks I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD an editorial evaluation of the ORRRC report, as printed in the Idaho Daily Statesman of Boise, Idaho.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### AS A MATTER OF INFORMATION

The Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, set up by act of Congress, has completed 3 years' labors, and turned in its report.

It's the report we've been advised to wait for and to study before irrevocably rejecting, or precipitately plopping for, a lately trumped up scheme to lock up several thousand Idaho acres in a wilderness area.

It's advice that seems to have been pretty good.

This Commission of 15 members, with the chairman of the Rockefeller Brothers Fund as its leader and including Idaho's Republican Senator HENRY DWORSHAK and Democratic Representative GRACIE PROSS, is to be accepted as a fairly representative group.

With the assistance of a 60-member staff and with almost as many members of its advisory council, this Commission has produced a 246-page printed report, with illustrations and graphs that is a work of art.

It's a comprehensive summation of statistics and projections that pretty well covers the field from big-town playgrounds to vast wilderness areas. It pretty thoroughly appraises existing facilities for outdoor recreation, and their utilization, and then, allowing for probable increases in individual income and leisure time and, of course, increase of population, it undertakes to figure out future requirements in this field of activity.

It's so wide ranging that, like the Scriptures, it can be quoted by the devil.

It does propose the creation of a new Bureau of Outdoor Recreation in the Department of the Interior to provide leadership, coordination, and assistance, but generally its specific recommendations have been held to a minimum while it stresses the key role of State governments and the responsibility of local governments.

Of particular interest is this report's analysis of public demand for outdoor recreational facilities. It shows, for instance, that driving and walking for pleasure, swimming, and picnicking lead the list of outdoor activities in which Americans participate, and driving for pleasure is most popular of all, and that interest in boating and water sports is sharply on the upturn.

It shows that outdoor opportunities are most urgently needed near metropolitan areas, where the need is most difficult to satisfy.

It shows that 53 percent of the country's motorists travel 250 miles or less from home on vacation trips; that only 10 percent of them travel as far as 2,000 miles, and that only 2 percent of the participants in outdoor

activities go in for such things as horseback riding or nature and bird walks.

These, incidentally, are statistics that indicate no very widely prevailing interest in wilderness or primitive areas in which there would be no development of public roads, permanent habitations, or recreation facilities of any sort and would be esteemed for the most part on account of their inspirational, esthetic, scientific, and cultural values.

The report points out, too, that outdoor recreation is often compatible with other resource uses.

In general, it's a report that's limited pretty well as it should be to providing information as a basis on which projects and programs in this field may be built wisely and well.

It's well deserving of serious attention.

# REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 1 OF 1962—DEPARTMENT OF URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, Reorganization Plan No. 1 appears to be quite dead, as a result of the action taken not only by the Senate on Tuesday, but also by the House yesterday. If I recall correctly, the vote in the House was 264 to 150, against the plan, in effect.

In the President's news conference of yesterday he made some statements which possibly could carry an unfortunate inference. I believe they should be clarified.

One statement was:

The difficulty, of course, is that many of those who do not live in urban areas are opposed to it.

He was referring, of course to the proposed Reorganization Plan No. 1, to establish a Department of Urban Affairs.

That statement may, unfortunately, raise the inference that this was a vote of rural area interests against urban area interests. Such an inference should be set aside. It should be pointed out that of the 437 Members of the House of Representatives, 300 come from districts which are classified as over 50 percent urban. Since the proposal mustered only 150 votes, it is apparent that at least half of the Members of the House who come from preponderantly urban districts did not see fit to support it.

As evidence of this classification of these districts, I refer to a release from the U.S. Department of Commerce, dated February 24, 1962. I ask unanimous consent that it may be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

## URBAN OUTNUMBER RURAL DISTRICTS IN CONGRESS, 300 TO 137

Members of the 87th Congress representing districts with urban population in the majority outnumber representatives of districts predominantly rural by a margin of more than 2 to 1, according to an examination of 1960 Census of Population counts by the Bureau of the Census, U.S. Department of Commerce.

The 1960 census data show that of the 437 congressional districts, as constituted for the current session, those with population more than 50 percent urban numbered 300. The rural population exceeded the urban population in 137 districts.

Of the 300 districts in which the urban population exceeds the rural population,

207 were two-thirds or more urban, including 80 districts with 100 percent urban population. Of the 137 districts with more rural than urban population, 41 districts were two-thirds or more rural.

## Urban population as percent of total population for congressional districts: 1960

State and congressional district	1960	Percent urban
Alabama.....	3,266,740	54.8
1st.....	441,490	66.2
2d.....	386,075	55.7
3d.....	310,947	45.3
4th.....	315,817	42.8
5th.....	305,941	44.9
6th.....	251,765	38.9
7th.....	236,216	21.0
8th.....	383,625	48.5
9th.....	634,864	84.6
Alaska (1 Representative at Large).....	226,167	37.9
Arizona.....	1,302,161	74.5
1st.....	663,510	86.5
2d.....	638,651	62.1
Arkansas.....	1,786,272	42.8
1st.....	360,183	35.7
2d.....	182,314	17.7
3d.....	299,727	39.9
4th.....	301,286	40.9
5th.....	320,767	69.9
6th.....	322,005	42.6
California.....	15,717,204	86.4
1st.....	547,593	52.5
2d.....	406,506	35.2
3d.....	665,064	77.8
4th.....	375,371	100.0
5th.....	364,945	100.0
6th.....	544,604	80.5
7th.....	293,517	100.0
8th.....	613,625	98.0
9th.....	444,387	97.6
10th.....	741,930	90.3
11th.....	407,283	65.4
12th.....	406,859	59.9
13th.....	647,495	61.7
14th.....	510,341	57.6
15th.....	389,753	100.0
16th.....	285,038	98.4
17th.....	773,555	99.4
18th.....	423,225	100.0
19th.....	643,176	100.0
20th.....	253,360	100.0
21st.....	719,856	94.7
22d.....	435,392	98.9
23d.....	532,779	100.0
24th.....	266,659	100.0
25th.....	803,302	97.7
26th.....	512,676	100.0
27th.....	503,591	74.4
28th.....	1,014,460	90.7
29th.....	378,296	66.9
30th.....	722,476	98.5
Colorado.....	1,753,947	73.7
1st.....	493,887	100.0
2d.....	653,964	69.7
3d.....	410,555	66.6
4th.....	195,551	35.5
Connecticut.....	2,535,234	78.3
1st.....	689,555	83.2
2d.....	411,919	48.8
3d.....	461,229	88.1
4th.....	653,589	87.0
5th.....	318,942	73.8
Delaware (1 Representative at Large).....	446,292	65.6
Florida.....	4,951,560	73.9
1st.....	820,443	82.1
2d.....	474,946	83.1
3d.....	563,646	52.4
4th.....	982,968	94.4
5th.....	739,006	59.4
6th.....	743,966	80.9
7th.....	386,593	61.7
8th.....	239,992	37.4
Georgia.....	3,943,116	55.3
1st.....	379,933	56.9
2d.....	361,123	48.7
3d.....	422,198	52.7
4th.....	323,489	42.9
5th.....	823,680	90.1
6th.....	350,235	53.9
7th.....	450,740	39.4

1 Connecticut has 1 Representative at Large.

## Urban population as percent of total population for congressional districts: 1960—Con.

State and congressional district	1960	Percent urban
Georgia—Continued		
8th.....	291,185	45.5
9th.....	272,154	18.9
10th.....	348,379	50.3
Hawaii (1 Representative at Large).....	632,772	76.5
Idaho.....	667,191	47.5
1st.....	257,242	41.4
2d.....	409,949	51.4
Illinois.....	10,081,158	80.7
1st.....	235,202	100.0
2d.....	348,840	100.0
3d.....	419,509	100.0
4th.....	731,665	96.6
5th.....	371,224	100.0
6th.....	345,284	100.0
7th.....	342,901	100.0
8th.....	277,269	100.0
9th.....	302,658	100.0
10th.....	433,692	100.0
11th.....	349,015	100.0
12th.....	360,360	100.0
13th.....	905,761	89.9
14th.....	605,915	78.3
15th.....	414,347	63.6
16th.....	434,042	65.2
17th.....	387,204	48.0
18th.....	352,483	66.8
19th.....	350,515	65.4
20th.....	279,821	41.2
21st.....	354,910	51.4
22d.....	392,300	64.9
23d.....	297,544	35.8
24th.....	457,198	77.2
25th.....	301,498	42.4
Indiana.....	4,662,498	62.4
1st.....	513,269	93.6
2d.....	357,309	37.9
3d.....	472,958	68.7
4th.....	390,010	58.1
5th.....	459,473	55.4
6th.....	333,783	46.0
7th.....	329,213	41.0
8th.....	423,929	61.0
9th.....	290,596	31.1
10th.....	394,391	53.1
11th.....	697,567	91.2
Iowa.....	2,757,537	53.0
1st.....	403,048	61.1
2d.....	465,828	55.2
3d.....	395,657	52.7
4th.....	236,585	41.3
5th.....	406,972	75.1
6th.....	289,445	35.0
7th.....	260,359	40.0
8th.....	299,643	47.5
Kansas.....	2,178,611	61.0
1st.....	358,852	53.9
2d.....	462,207	77.6
3d.....	212,520	57.2
4th.....	580,124	71.0
5th.....	320,202	46.0
6th.....	244,706	39.3
Kentucky.....	3,038,156	44.5
1st.....	317,436	31.1
2d.....	321,303	39.1
3d.....	610,947	88.5
4th.....	303,431	17.4
5th.....	329,116	38.9
6th.....	411,459	50.8
7th.....	420,816	17.4
8th.....	323,648	18.4
Louisiana.....	3,257,022	63.3
1st.....	449,491	94.3
2d.....	499,561	89.3
3d.....	387,207	49.3
4th.....	391,541	64.9
5th.....	345,013	44.8
6th.....	536,029	53.6
7th.....	384,330	53.9
8th.....	263,850	36.7
Maine.....	969,265	51.3
1st.....	349,291	58.6
2d.....	304,984	53.3
3d.....	314,990	41.3
Maryland.....	3,100,689	72.7
1st.....	243,570	21.1
2d.....	621,935	72.0
3d.....	268,826	100.0

Urban population as percent of total population for congressional districts: 1960—Con.

State and congressional district	1960	Percent urban
Maryland—Continued		
4th	283,320	100.0
5th	711,045	60.7
6th	608,666	66.9
7th	373,327	100.0
Massachusetts	5,148,578	83.6
1st	319,971	68.1
2d	411,128	85.0
3d	348,500	66.5
4th	409,912	82.2
5th	474,691	77.8
6th	336,819	89.1
7th	281,202	97.6
8th	351,794	90.2
9th	418,449	65.8
10th	377,311	100.0
11th	272,361	100.0
12th	285,056	100.0
13th	450,929	98.4
14th	410,455	71.5
Michigan	7,823,194	73.4
1st	283,302	100.0
2d	483,343	53.4
3d	427,899	57.3
4th	366,991	34.8
5th	461,906	74.0
6th	623,842	75.3
7th	664,556	63.7
8th	398,106	50.5
9th	312,854	48.0
10th	308,917	40.2
11th	240,793	43.7
12th	177,431	47.6
13th	268,040	100.0
14th	462,192	100.0
15th	337,017	100.0
16th	802,994	93.1
17th	512,752	97.8
18th	690,259	88.2
Minnesota	3,413,864	62.2
1st	376,573	47.8
2d	374,160	42.6
3d	697,572	88.8
4th	422,525	98.8
5th	310,579	100.0
6th	332,823	24.0
7th	300,762	23.7
8th	332,795	61.2
9th	266,075	30.6
Mississippi	2,178,141	37.7
1st	264,963	28.6
2d	237,887	19.7
3d	370,554	33.3
4th	460,100	63.8
5th	295,072	25.8
6th	449,565	49.4
Missouri	4,319,813	66.6
1st	568,029	97.4
2d	543,060	92.8
3d	342,469	100.0
4th	470,660	72.2
5th	302,813	100.0
6th	361,919	54.0
7th	403,253	44.9
8th	334,455	18.6
9th	376,488	35.7
10th	301,098	37.9
11th	315,569	46.4
Montana	674,767	50.2
1st	274,194	51.4
2d	400,573	49.3
Nebraska	1,411,330	54.3
1st	380,532	53.7
2d	421,198	84.7
3d	296,592	26.7
4th	313,005	40.3
Nevada (1 Representative at large)	285,278	70.4
New Hampshire	606,921	58.3
1st	331,818	61.6
2d	275,103	54.2
New Jersey	6,066,782	88.6
1st	585,586	84.5
2d	316,285	75.5
3d	614,125	70.4
4th	490,891	81.0
5th	667,906	81.1
6th	504,255	100.0
7th	555,555	78.4

Urban population as percent of total population for congressional districts: 1960—Con.

State and congressional district	1960	Percent urban
New Jersey—Continued		
8th	394,279	100.0
9th	451,126	100.0
10th	303,058	100.0
11th	308,660	100.0
12th	362,914	99.2
13th	256,977	100.0
14th	255,165	100.0
New Mexico (2 Representatives at large)	951,023	65.9
New York	16,782,304	85.4
1st	906,187	79.5
2d	506,197	99.3
3d	554,571	100.0
4th	467,354	100.0
5th	391,403	100.0
6th	507,685	100.0
7th	372,215	100.0
8th	356,961	100.0
9th	391,239	100.0
10th	353,782	100.0
11th	411,988	100.0
12th	316,177	100.0
13th	353,313	100.0
14th	339,465	100.0
15th	397,276	100.0
16th	301,574	100.0
17th	260,235	100.0
18th	269,368	100.0
19th	301,499	100.0
20th	279,475	100.0
21st	286,130	100.0
22d	327,213	100.0
23d	335,166	100.0
24th	347,890	100.0
25th	414,546	100.0
26th	402,204	88.5
27th	438,409	91.0
28th	409,349	52.8
29th	396,122	37.0
30th	339,858	81.5
31st	365,249	43.5
32d	317,649	67.6
33d	353,183	41.2
34th	385,406	66.9
35th	423,028	80.9
36th	358,174	40.9
37th	446,860	64.0
38th	413,498	81.0
39th	363,824	66.7
40th	473,750	85.6
41st	332,776	100.0
42d	500,431	74.7
43d	313,595	44.4
North Carolina	4,556,155	39.5
1st	253,511	30.5
2d	313,728	30.6
3d	382,124	21.7
4th	442,059	39.0
5th	408,992	44.5
6th	487,159	67.5
7th	455,630	33.6
8th	396,369	23.2
9th	364,561	38.6
10th	452,732	58.5
11th	307,575	39.5
12th	291,715	31.1
North Dakota (2 Representatives at large)	632,446	35.2
Ohio	9,706,397	73.4
1st	375,753	95.7
2d	488,368	93.7
3d	726,156	86.4
4th	356,994	46.1
5th	298,051	34.5
6th	380,847	31.7
7th	435,621	52.1
8th	290,694	54.6
9th	456,931	92.6
10th	274,441	40.3
11th	512,022	56.9
12th	682,962	92.2
13th	389,312	68.9
14th	578,884	82.3
15th	236,288	36.5
16th	492,651	63.6
17th	375,504	50.3
18th	328,921	49.7
19th	378,122	82.4
20th	465,341	100.0
21st	421,804	100.0
22d	357,998	99.5
23d	402,752	98.8
Oklahoma	2,328,284	62.9
1st	521,542	77.8
2d	368,976	43.5
3d	227,692	34.8

Urban population as percent of total population for congressional districts: 1960—Con.

State and congressional district	1960	Percent urban
Oklahoma—Continued		
4th	252,208	53.6
5th	552,863	89.4
6th	405,003	47.0
Oregon	1,768,687	62.2
1st	517,678	51.4
2d	265,164	44.1
3d	522,813	96.4
4th	463,032	46.1
Pennsylvania	11,319,366	71.6
1st	260,767	100.0
2d	344,174	100.0
3d	273,911	100.0
4th	314,909	100.0
5th	461,287	100.0
6th	347,464	100.0
7th	553,154	96.0
8th	536,103	77.0
9th	488,967	47.0
10th	328,127	67.5
11th	346,972	81.1
12th	277,165	57.0
13th	516,682	79.5
14th	275,414	64.3
15th	293,568	63.3
16th	353,564	61.2
17th	332,813	42.8
18th	354,049	24.9
19th	415,058	52.1
20th	297,384	50.2
21st	352,629	60.7
22d	358,173	44.5
23d	291,407	39.5
24th	456,157	62.9
25th	434,552	55.2
26th	426,035	34.2
27th	472,113	100.0
28th	328,164	100.0
29th	426,742	100.0
30th	401,568	100.0
Rhode Island	859,488	86.4
1st	399,782	89.4
2d	459,706	83.9
South Carolina	2,382,594	41.2
1st	421,478	44.5
2d	531,555	47.7
3d	318,809	26.7
4th	444,230	49.1
5th	272,220	35.2
6th	394,302	27.8
South Dakota	680,514	39.3
1st	497,669	38.5
2d	182,845	41.2
Tennessee	3,567,089	52.3
1st	460,583	32.1
2d	497,121	51.5
3d	412,664	56.1
4th	389,563	27.3
5th	399,743	87.7
6th	324,357	28.9
7th	232,652	28.9
8th	223,387	27.4
9th	627,019	87.8
Texas	9,579,677	75.0
1st	245,942	45.8
2d	420,402	72.5
3d	293,942	48.0
4th	216,371	52.9
5th	951,527	97.5
6th	248,149	47.6
7th	265,629	38.9
8th	508,193	90.5
9th	498,775	56.0
10th	325,454	69.3
11th	329,484	64.8
12th	538,495	94.6
13th	328,781	67.3
14th	539,262	68.7
15th	516,716	71.4
16th	573,438	84.9
17th	287,889	64.7
18th	363,596	69.2
19th	424,774	63.9
20th	687,151	93.4
21st	262,742	57.6
22d	674,965	97.9
Utah	890,627	74.9
1st	317,973	53.4
2d	572,654	86.7

**Urban population as percent of total population for congressional districts: 1960—Con.**

State and congressional district	1960	Percent urban
Vermont (1 Representative at large)	389,881	38.5
Virginia	3,966,949	55.6
1st	422,624	63.1
2d	494,292	95.2
3d	418,081	82.8
4th	352,157	27.4
5th	325,989	27.3
6th	378,864	57.1
7th	312,890	29.4
8th	352,461	21.8
9th	364,973	19.3
10th	639,618	88.8
Washington	2,853,214	68.1
1st	420,548	95.9
2d	366,395	48.7
3d	342,540	49.1
4th	414,764	53.9
5th	399,093	65.6
6th	399,362	68.6
7th	510,512	85.0
West Virginia	1,860,421	38.2
1st	273,107	61.6
2d	276,874	22.7
3d	268,334	22.8
4th	345,208	48.3
5th	275,813	19.6
6th	421,085	47.1
Wisconsin	3,951,777	63.8
1st	434,528	65.1
2d	530,316	63.5
3d	299,265	35.8
4th	615,367	100.0
5th	520,674	100.0
6th	376,325	59.1
7th	319,547	39.0
8th	411,807	60.0
9th	307,078	28.3
10th	236,870	33.0
Wyoming (1 Representative at large)	330,066	56.8

Mr. MILLER. Another point was made in the President's news conference with respect to the defeat of the urban affairs proposal, to the effect that some day "there is going to be an Urban Department."

I sincerely trust that we will never have a Department of Urban Affairs such as that meaningless proposal which came to Congress under Reorganization Plan No. 1.

I have been pointing out for several weeks now that Reorganization Plan No. 1 would do nothing except change the label on the outside of the building from "Housing and Home Finance Agency—Public Housing Administration" to "Department of Urban Affairs"; change Mr. Weaver's title from Head to Secretary; and add an Under Secretary of the Department for Urban Affairs at \$21,000 a year, and three Assistant Secretaries at \$20,000 a year.

That is all that would have been accomplished. How anyone can get excited about the defeat of that proposal and consider it a defeat for people living in cities is beyond me. The only way I can explain it is that people have not read Reorganization Plan No. 1. It might be a good idea if they would do so. Then they might realize why the plan was defeated as badly as it was.

It would be something else if the President saw fit to present a proposal to establish a meaningful Department of Urban Affairs, preferably to be called a Department of Community Develop-

ment—and even more preferably not a department, but a bureau within the Department of Commerce, to coordinate under one roof not only the Housing and Home Finance Agency and the Public Housing Administration, but also veterans' housing, area redevelopment, the Small Business Administration, and rural redevelopment; a proposal which would be meaningful for persons who live in metropolitan cities, in suburbia, in small towns, and in the rural areas. But the proposal which was acted upon yesterday in the House came to Congress in the insidious form of classism and racism.

The Washington Evening Star of today has published an editorial entitled "Deserved Defeat," which points this fact out very well.

Also, the Washington Evening Star of Friday, February 9, 1962, published an article entitled "Against an Urban Department," written by William S. White, which showed why this proposal should be defeated.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial and article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington, D.C., Evening Star, Feb. 22, 1962]

**DESERVED DEFEAT**

The President's plan to set up a Department of Urban Affairs has met with a crushing defeat in the House, and deservedly so. The adverse vote was 264 to 150, and this 114-vote margin was much larger than anyone had predicted.

One reason, certainly, stems from the crude political pressure tactic used by the Kennedy administration. The first indication of this came on Tuesday when the Senate, which probably would have voted in favor of the plan on its merits, rejected a maneuver to get the Senate on record before the House could act. To do this it was necessary to discharge the Senate committee considering the plan, although it was conceded the committee had not used delaying tactics. In short, this was an attempt to use the Senate as a club with which to belabor the House, and the scheme was rejected by the decisive margin of 58 to 42.

Before the vote in the House, there was a contrived effort to inject racism into the debate. This was set up by the President when he announced that, should the new Department be created, he would appoint Robert C. Weaver, a Negro, as its head. The effect was to put pressure on the Republicans, since a vote against creating the Department would be attacked as a vote against permitting a Negro to achieve Cabinet status. Of course, this automatically assured the opposition of virtually all Southern Democrats, and left Republicans who might be against the new Department on its merits in a position where they could and would be charged with racism. To their credit, the vast majority of House Republicans refused to be intimidated by this shabby strategy, and, somewhat surprisingly, they were joined in voting against the plan by a substantial number of Democrats from the West and Midwest.

We do not think that either the Senate or the House vote is an accurate reflection of sentiment with respect to the merits of the urban affairs plan, since it might have fared better had it not been for the attempt to put its opponents in such an obviously false position. Perhaps, as the President says, an urban affairs department surely will be

created later on. But the first requirement, we think, is for the administration to abandon the rash and even dangerous type of politicking which was the hallmark of this first unsuccessful effort.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Feb. 9, 1962]

**AGAINST AN URBAN DEPARTMENT—ARGUMENT OF "JUSTICE" CALLED NONSENSE, HARMFUL RESULTS ARE FEARED**

(By William S. White)

President Kennedy's plan to create a new Cabinet-rank Department of Urban Affairs ought to be rejected by Congress for the good of the country—and for the President's own good, if it comes to that.

Mr. Kennedy and Gov. Nelson Rockefeller of New York, who hopes to be Mr. Kennedy's GOP Presidential adversary in 1964, have been playing old-fashioned politics on the issue. The prize is the favor of minority groups and big-city people generally.

This is not against the Constitution nor in violation of tradition. All the same, while fun is fun, there is no sound reason to involve the country in this enterprise.

To set up such a department and create in the person of Dr. Robert Weaver an 11th member of the Cabinet would be short of a national calamity. But it would have obviously harmful results. The innuendo that opposition is based on the fact that Dr. Weaver is a Negro—and a distinguished one—is unfair. It may apply to a handful of Southern extremists. It is not the controlling factor, even to most Southerners. Certainly, it is not to the Republican opposition—though it is true that the Republicans asked for the situation in a way by happily needling Mr. Kennedy about "not doing enough for the Negro."

To proclaim as solemn Federal policy that city Americans are different from other Americans would be an act of national disunion when national unity was never more needed.

To declare that city people need a special Government department to have true "representation" would be to say baselessly that they don't now have fully adequate "representation."

To set up such a department would be to gather up into one immensely powerful new pressure agency dozens of economic, social, religious, and racial groups which, now operating separately, are already quite powerful enough.

The argument is made that because there long has been a Department of Agriculture "serving country people" justice is denied until there is a department "serving city people." This is demonstrable nonsense. The Department of Agriculture serves a fundamental all-national interest, production of food and fiber. The Commerce Department serves an all-national interest, American business. The Labor Department serves yet another all-national interest, American labor.

Obviously, Commerce is already more helpful to city than to country people. Obviously, so is Labor. So is Treasury.

Another argument is that the metropolitan centers can no longer solve their own problems. The logical extension of this is that a Federal Urban Department would shortly become the great dumping ground for metropolitan problems. Who in the cities will long suffer the headaches of housing and transportation if these can simply be painlessly handed over to Washington? What happens to municipal responsibility, to local self-government?

Of course, one motive is to reduce the undue power of rural pressure groups in Congress by increasing the power of urban pressure groups in the Cabinet. This is an odd remedy, however, when one considers that the big cities already have at the very

heart of the whole thing—the choosing of a President—a wholly disproportionate power both in the nominating and electing processes.

Finally, this reform is, amid our somber world realities, an unnecessarily little thing. What great cold war commander really wants to be remembered as the man who created a "Department of Urban Affairs" at an hour when national survival is in question? What hot war commander would want to be remembered as the man who improved the quartermaster's system of counting GI underwear?

#### NOMINATIONS FOR FEDERAL JUDGESHIPS

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, the Chicago Daily Tribune recently published an editorial entitled "Score: 82 to 0." The editorial relates to the action of the present administration in not adhering to its campaign assurances that politics would not be present in the appointment of Federal judges. The editorial states that of 82 nominations for Federal judgeships thus far under the New Frontier, not one has been of a Republican. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SCORE: 82 TO 0

Byron (Whizzer) White, the Deputy Attorney General, was an artful dodger when he played football, and he showed that he has not lost his skill when he appeared before the House of Delegates of the American Bar Association at its midwinter meeting here. He faced the task of explaining why his boss, President Kennedy, has made 82 nominations for Federal judgeships without naming 1 Republican.

Mr. Kennedy is the same Kennedy who in August 1960, when he was a Senator, wrote to the President of the American Bar Association as follows: "I would hope that the paramount consideration in the appointment of a judge would not be his political party, but his qualifications for the office. Please be assured of my cooperation in the effort to achieve your objectives in this regard."

In an address on October 17, 1960, when he was a presidential candidate, Mr. Kennedy vowed that all his appointments would be made "on the basis of ability—without regard to race, creed, national origin, sex, section, or occupation." He added, "I want the best."

How these promises have been kept was explained by Bernard G. Segal, head of the Federal judiciary committee of the bar association. He recalled that when Mr. Kennedy took office the party affiliation of Federal judges was just about evenly divided between Republicans and Democrats.

"Now, once again," he said, "the imbalance has set in. Except for two recess appointees of the last administration and one member of the Liberal Party in New York, every other appointee of the past year was a Democrat."

Mr. Segal also reported that of the 85 Kennedy nominations and recess appointments, the bar association's Federal judiciary committee found 14 exceptionally well qualified, 41 well qualified, 23 qualified, and 7 not qualified.

These embarrassing statistics did not rattle Deputy Attorney General White. First he tried a quarterback sneak by saying that there is diversified opinion as to qualifications for the Federal bench. His next play was a long forward pass in which he insisted that all the 82 Democrats appointed by the

President were chosen on the basis of ability, not political affiliation.

In football one of the most important elements is deception. Now you see the ball, and now you don't. What counts at the end of the game is the score, not the biographies of the players on the scorecard.

The old Whizzer is on a team which is so powerful that it does not have to worry about campaign promises or about the views of high-minded idealists in the bar association. So the score is 82 to 0.

#### COMMUNITY ACTION GETS RESULTS

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, the January 1962 issue of the magazine Iowa Industrial Expansion contains a short but very interesting article relating to the benefits of community action.

The article demonstrates the results which can be obtained from a city's pulling itself up by its own bootstraps, so to speak, and entering into community action. The city concerned is my hometown of Sioux City, which is in the current competition for one of the awards for All-America City.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "Sioux City's Community Action Gets Results" be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### SIXTEEN BIG STEPS FORWARD—SIOUX CITY'S COMMUNITY ACTION GETS RESULTS

"Sioux City has embarked upon more major improvement programs in a short span of time and has seen more concrete results of these efforts than any community of comparable size in the country."

Such a statement is not made as a boast by loyal Sioux Cityans today, but as a simple statement of fact. Sioux City's list of accomplishments is the result of total community action, says George Wimmer, manager of the Industrial Development Council of Sioux City.

The following 16 achievements are a part of the total community program that has resulted from total community action:

1. A \$7 million sewage treatment plant is under construction and scheduled for completion by 1963.
2. All major highways leading into Sioux City have been improved and Interstate Highway 29 now serves as an intercity expressway connecting this metropolis with the great Interstate Highway System.
3. A \$17 million flood control project in the Floyd Valley, to be completed by 1964, is underway.
4. A \$4,200,000 urban renewal project is in progress.
5. The bridge across the Missouri River joining Sioux City and South Sioux City, Nebr., has been widened to four lanes. Another bridge crossing this river is contemplated.
6. Golfers will be yelling "fore" next season on a new 18-hole public golf course.
7. A \$100 million Sage installation went into operation late in 1961 as an essential part of America's defense system.
8. A Capehart housing project costing more than \$4 million was completed near the Sioux City Municipal Airport.
9. A master plan for Sioux City's development through 1980 has been developed, accepted, and put into effect.
10. More than \$20 million has been spent on improvements by the Sioux City Municipal Airport.
11. New street lights have been installed in downtown Sioux City and along the in-

terstate highway bordering the Missouri River.

12. Enlargement programs are in effect at the city's three institutions of higher learning—Morningside, Briar Cliff, and the National Business Training College.

13. Two multimillion dollar shopping centers have been opened, one in the fast-growing north side, the other in an 8¼-acre private enterprise redevelopment downtown.

14. A new \$25 million powerplant is being built by Iowa Public Service Co.

15. New zoning ordinances for the entire city will become effective January 1, 1962.

16. Within the past 3 years, 45 manufacturers have expanded their operations in Sioux City. In addition, 10 new industries have been welcomed to the business community.

The Industrial Development Council of Sioux City and its sister unit, the Industrial Development Expansion Association, Inc., or IDEA, Inc., is managed by a full-time staff. Through its efforts the Tri-View Industrial District, a carefully engineered 90-acre industrial plot, was developed for industry.

The district faces the scenic Missouri River and is ideally located on an interchange of Interstate Highway 29.

Of the 90 original acres, only 39 remain unoccupied. There are 10 different facilities in the district including 8 manufacturers and distributors, a plush 160-unit Holiday Inn motel, and a maintenance garage for the Iowa highway commission. The baby of the Tri-View family is the 35,000 square foot Container Corp. of America plant presently under construction.

#### THREAT OF COMMON MARKET TO U.S. FARMER

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, the Waterloo (Iowa) Daily Courier, of February 19, 1962, published an excellent lead editorial entitled "Is Common Market Big Threat to U.S. Farmer?" The editorial states that the unfortunate action recently taken by the Common Market in establishing an agricultural policy of becoming self-sufficient in agricultural matters could have a disastrous effect on future American exports of agricultural products.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### IS COMMON MARKET BIG THREAT TO U.S. FARMER?

As noted in these columns earlier this month, the six nations of the Common Market have decided on a protectionist policy on agricultural products which will deny American farmers a part of the export market they now enjoy.

Internal tariffs among the six nations will be gradually reduced to the vanishing point and in their place will be imposed a sliding tariff scale for all which amounts to the difference between the Common Market support prices and the world market price. This means these nations after 1965 will import only what cannot be produced internally; and high support prices will drastically stimulate internal production.

The West German support price on wheat, for example, is \$3 a bushel and the French figure is \$2.20 a bushel. The compromise figure is expected to be about \$2.60 as compared to about \$2.15 in the United States. The way in which supports with modern technology can increase production is illustrated in the case of Great Britain, which, before World War II, was feeding only a third of its population from domestic pro-

duction and now is feeding half of an increasing population. The overall production increase has been 60 percent.

According to C. H. Carmichael in the New York Times, "The Common Market is bound to bring about a sharp decline in imports of farm products to the six member countries. Because of the variable tariff duties, the United States would be able to sell those countries only those items they could not produce. This would be only cotton."

(The European countries do not currently produce soybeans and may not attempt to do so. However, an import levy would be imposed if they decided to produce this crop.)

Since only about 2½ percent of American feed-grain production has been exported to the Common Market countries in the past, the eventual loss of perhaps half of the entire market would not exactly be disastrous. Moreover, the loss of the market will be gradual as the Common Market builds toward agricultural self-sufficiency.

But about 7 percent of American soybean production has gone in the past to Common Market countries; and the impact of the loss of this market would be more serious. This is where the United States must use its bargaining power in trade negotiations.

That is why Senator JACK MILLER, Republican, of Iowa, declared in the Senate the other day: "Let me make it very clear that I for one do not propose to expand the President's powers to negotiate new reciprocal trade agreements with the Common Market or the Common Market nations unless I have satisfactory assurance that this is to be a truly quid pro quo arrangement—a two-way street, if you please, which will assure continuance of our agricultural exports."

#### PRESERVATION OF VIEW FROM GEORGE WASHINGTON'S HOME AT MOUNT VERNON

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I think it is appropriate to call attention, during our observance of George Washington's Birthday, to the fact that the 87th Congress has indicated its reverence of his memory, and those things for which his memory stands, by more than words.

On last September 20 the Senate passed what is now Public Law 87-362 authorizing the acquisition of lands and easements to lands across the Potomac River from Mount Vernon for the purpose of preserving the view from the Washington home. The House measure, which the Senate passed, was a companion to a Senate bill which I had the honor to introduce on June 6, 1961. The measure was signed into law on October 4, 1961. The authorized appropriation of \$937,000 is a very modest but very important sum, for it will assure that the environs at Mount Vernon, and the view from what Mrs. John F. Kennedy has described as "the Nation's most revered house," will not be violated by a sewage treatment plant, an oil tank farm, or other development which would alter its character.

I am always reluctant to hinder or restrain business development, or governmental agencies, such as the Suburban Sanitary Commission. The business activities are desirable and essential to the maintenance of a healthy economy. The provision of sanitary facilities is a necessity but I am sure that there are alternative sites where a sewage treatment plant can be erected, one capable of meeting the future needs of the area as

well as the present. And there are alternative sites for industrial and commercial development.

There is no problem involved here of making impossible desirable industrial development or construction of essential public facilities. They can be located elsewhere, and it is to the credit of Congress that we have voted that such development shall not be permitted to intrude upon the majesty of this most important historical site.

Many people and organizations are to be congratulated for their part in preserving the dignity and beauty of the environs of Mount Vernon. The distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], who held hearings and steered the preservation bill through the Senate, is one of them.

The Mount Vernon Ladies' Association has done our Nation a great service in the restoration and preservation of Mount Vernon itself, and in stimulating the protection of the area.

On the House side, Representative ASPINALL, chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, Representative SAYLOR, who sponsored the bill, Representative RUTHERFORD and Representative BOLTON deserve special thanks for their leadership.

Representative BOLTON, as vice regent of the Ladies Mount Vernon Association and as a principal officer of the Accokeek Foundation, which now stands ready to donate its lands to the Federal Government, has done the Nation an especially great service, as will all of those citizens who are helping to give the Government land and easements without cost, so as to make protection of the area possible.

Mr. President, we can all take pride in Public Law 87-362 and the assurance it gives that Mount Vernon and the Potomac River area around it will be preserved as a link between living generations and the man who led his countrymen—our forebears—in the establishment of a government of freemen.

#### PLIGHT OF SENIOR CITIZENS WHO LIVE ON SMALL INCOMES

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the grave plight of our senior citizens who live on small pensions or social security payments, when faced with the high costs of modern medical care, is a cause for deep concern. On many occasions I have risen in the Senate to present letters from individuals in my own State who are facing this plight in a very immediate way.

I have received letter after letter from older persons who fervently desire to care for themselves and to sustain a life of dignity on their heartbreakingly limited incomes. The number of these letters is borne out statistically by the fact that more than half of our senior citizens over the age of 65 have annual incomes of less than \$1,000. With the high cost of hospital, surgical, and medical treatment under modern conditions, these individuals are obviously completely unable to pay for the medical services that they need. To require a means test or other form of pauper's oath is an affront to human dignity, as

well as—under these circumstances—absurd in view of the fact that so many of our older people are within that category.

The sound and dignified way to provide the medical care which our senior citizens need and deserve is through the time-tested social security insurance system. Such a program of medical benefits would be self-financing and would provide these benefits, not as charity, but as a matter of right, which is as it ought to be.

Recently I received a letter from Kenosha, Wis., telling me in moving personal terms of the problem a woman faces in trying to get essential medical care while living on her social security income. I ask unanimous consent that this deeply moving letter be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

KENOSHA, WIS., January 18, 1962.

DEAR SENATOR PROXMIRE: I am an old lady 70 years old. I have only \$40 social security every month. I have to pay \$12.55 for hospital and medical insurance, so I have only \$27.45 to live on. How do you expect a person can live?

So dear Senator will you please for God's sake vote for the bill to be passed for hospital and medical on social security?

I have not 1 cent income of my own and no home. I have to share with my son and grandchildren. My son is out of a job too sometimes. He used to work for Simmons. As you know they moved out, leaving so many workers jobless.

Hoping and praying that you vote yes,  
Sincerely,

Mrs. A. R.

#### ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Monday, February 26, 1962.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 56 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, February 26, 1962, at 12 o'clock meridian.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 22, 1962

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

II Timothy 2: 7: *The Lord give Thee understanding in all things.*

O Thou God of all grace, on this 22d day of February, we are commemorating the birth and life of our first President, whose name shines like a star in the crown of humanity.

Our hearts expand with pride as we think of his courage in times of adversity and his loyalty to the principles of righteousness and justice which constrained him to champion the cause of the distressed colonists.

We thank Thee for his devout faith which sent him down upon his knees in prayer in order that he might know how to keep in step with the will and wisdom of God.

Grant that the memory of his life may stir and strengthen the soul of our Republic to live in the fear of the Lord and to labor for the blessedness of all mankind.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, without being considered as a precedent, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so may have permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter for today only.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

### CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS DISPENSED WITH

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday of next week may be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

### GEORGE WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the order of the House of February 6, 1962, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROUSH] to read George Washington's Farewell Address.

Mr. ROUSH read the Farewell Address, as follows:

*To the People of the United States:*

FRIENDS AND FELLOW CITIZENS: The period for a new election of a citizen to administer the executive government of the United States being not far distant, and the time actually arrived when your thoughts must be employed in designating the person who is to be clothed with that important trust, it appears to me proper, especially as it may conduce to a more distinct expression of the public voice, that I should now apprise you of the resolution I have formed, to decline being considered among the number of those, out of whom a choice is to be made.

I beg you, at the same time, to do me the justice to be assured, that this resolution has not been taken, without a strict regard to all the considerations appertaining to the relation which binds a dutiful citizen to his country; and that, in withdrawing the tender of service which silence in my situation might imply, I am influenced by no diminution of zeal for your future interest; no deficiency of grateful respect for your past kindness; but am supported by a full

conviction that the step is compatible with both.

The acceptance of, and continuance hitherto in the office to which your suffrages have twice called me, have been a uniform sacrifice of inclination to the opinion of duty, and to a deference for what appeared to be your desire. I constantly hoped that it would have been much earlier in my power, consistently with motives which I was not at liberty to disregard, to return to that retirement from which I had been reluctantly drawn. The strength of my inclination to do this, previous to the last election, had even led to the preparation of an address to declare it to you; but mature reflection on the then perplexed and critical posture of our affairs with foreign nations, and the unanimous advice of persons entitled to my confidence, impelled me to abandon the idea.

I rejoice that the state of your concerns, external as well as internal, no longer renders the pursuit of inclination incompatible with the sentiment of duty or propriety; and am persuaded, whatever partiality may be retained for my services, that in the present circumstances of our country, you will not disapprove my determination to retire.

The impressions with which I first undertook the arduous trust, were explained on the proper occasion. In the discharge of this trust, I will only say that I have, with good intentions, contributed towards the organization and administration of the government, the best exertions of which a very fallible judgment was capable. Not unconscious in the outset, of the inferiority of my qualifications, experience, in my own eyes, perhaps still more in the eyes of others, has strengthened the motives to diffidence of myself; and, every day, the increasing weight of years admonishes me more and more, that the shade of retirement is as necessary to me as it will be welcome. Satisfied that if any circumstances have given peculiar value to my services they were temporary, I have the consolation to believe that, while choice and prudence invite me to quit the political scene, patriotism does not forbid it.

In looking forward to the moment which is to terminate the career of my political life, my feelings do not permit me to suspend the deep acknowledgment of that debt of gratitude which I owe to my beloved country, for the many honors it has conferred upon me; still more for the steadfast confidence with which it has supported me; and for the opportunities I have thence enjoyed of manifesting my inviolable attachment, by services faithful and persevering, though in usefulness unequal to my zeal. If benefits have resulted to our country from these services, let it always be remembered to your praise, and as an instructive example in our annals, that under circumstances in which the passions, agitated in every direction, were liable to mislead amidst appearances sometimes dubious, vicissitudes of fortune often discouraging—in situations in which not unfrequently want of suc-

cess has countenanced the spirit of criticism, the constancy of your support was the essential prop of the efforts, and a guarantee of the plans, by which they were effected. Profoundly penetrated with this idea, I shall carry it with me to my grave, as a strong incitement to unceasing vows that heaven may continue to you the choicest tokens of its beneficence—that your union and brotherly affection may be perpetual—that the free constitution, which is the work of your hands, may be sacredly maintained—that its administration in every department may be stamped with wisdom and virtue—that, in fine, the happiness of the people of these states, under the auspices of liberty, may be made complete by so careful a preservation, and so prudent a use of this blessing, as will acquire to them the glory of recommending it to the applause, the affection and adoption of every nation which is yet a stranger to it.

Here, perhaps, I ought to stop. But a solicitude for your welfare, which cannot end but with my life, and the apprehension of danger, natural to that solicitude, urge me, on an occasion like the present, to offer to your solemn contemplation, and to recommend to your frequent review, some sentiments which are the result of much reflection, of no inconsiderable observation, and which appear to me all important to the permanency of your felicity as a people. These will be offered to you with the more freedom, as you can only see in them the disinterested warnings of a parting friend, who can possibly have no personal motive to bias his counsel. Nor can I forget, as an encouragement to it, your indulgent reception of my sentiments on a former and not dissimilar occasion.

Interwoven as is the love of liberty with every ligament of your hearts, no recommendation of mine is necessary to fortify or confirm the attachment.

The unity of government which constitutes you one people, is also now dear to you. It is justly so; for it is a main pillar in the edifice of your real independence; the support of your tranquility at home; your peace abroad; of your safety; of your prosperity; of that very liberty which you so highly prize. But as it is easy to foresee that, from different causes and from different quarters much pains will be taken, many artifices employed, to weaken in your minds the conviction of this truth, as this is the point in your political fortress against which the batteries of internal and external enemies will be most constantly and actively (though often covertly and insidiously) directed; it is of infinite moment, that you should properly estimate the immense value of your national union to your collective and individual happiness; that you should cherish a cordial, habitual, and immovable attachment to it; accustoming yourselves to think and speak of it as the palladium of your political safety and prosperity; watching for its preservation with jealous anxiety; discountenancing whatever may suggest even a suspicion that it can, in any event, be abandoned; and indig-

nantly frowning upon the first dawning of every attempt to alienate any portion of our country from the rest, or to enfeeble the sacred ties which now link together the various parts.

For this you have every inducement of sympathy and interest. Citizens by birth, or choice, of a common country, that country has a right to concentrate your affections. The name of American, which belongs to you in your national capacity, must always exalt the just pride of patriotism, more than any appellation derived from local discriminations. With slight shades of difference, you have the same religion, manners, habits, and political principles. You have, in a common cause, fought and triumphed together; the independence and liberty you possess, are the work of joint councils, and joint efforts, of common dangers, suffering and successes.

But these considerations, however powerfully they addressed themselves to your sensibility, are greatly outweighed by those which apply more immediately to your interest.—Here, every portion of our country finds the most commanding motives for carefully guarding and preserving the union of the whole.

The *north*, in an unrestrained intercourse with the *south*, protected by the equal laws of a common government, finds in the production of the latter, great additional resources of maritime and commercial enterprise, and precious materials of manufacturing industry.—The *south* in the same intercourse, benefiting by the same agency of the *north*, sees its agriculture grow and its commerce expand. Turning partly into its own channels the seamen of the *north*, it finds its particular navigation invigorated; and while it contributes, in different ways, to nourish and increase the general mass of the national navigation, it looks forward to the protection of a maritime strength, to which itself is unequally adapted. The *east*, in a like intercourse with the *west*, already finds, and in the progressive improvement of interior communications by land and water, will more and more find a valuable vent for the commodities which it brings from abroad, or manufactures at home. The *west* derives from the *east* supplies requisite to its growth and comfort—and what is perhaps of still greater consequence, it must of necessity owe the secure enjoyments of indispensable outlets for its own productions, to the weight, influence, and the future maritime strength of the Atlantic side of the Union, directed by an indissoluble community of interest as *one nation*. Any other tenure by which the *west* can hold this essential advantage, whether derived from its own separate strength; or from an apostate and unnatural connection with any foreign power, must be intrinsically precarious.

While then every part of our country thus feels an immediate and particular interest in union, all the parts combined cannot fail to find in the united mass of means and efforts, greater strength, greater resource, proportionably greater security from external dan-

ger, a less frequent interruption of their peace by foreign nations; and, what is of inestimable value, they must derive from union, an exemption from those broils and wars between themselves which so frequently afflict neighboring countries not tied together by the same government; which their own rivalry alone would be sufficient to produce, but which opposite foreign alliances, attachments, and intrigues, would stimulate and embitter. Hence likewise, they will avoid the necessity of those overgrown military establishments, which under any form of government are inauspicious to liberty, and which are to be regarded as particularly hostile to republican liberty. In this sense it is, that your union ought to be considered as a main prop of your liberty, and that the love of the one ought to endear to you the preservation of the other.

These considerations speak a persuasive language to every reflecting and virtuous mind and exhibit the continuance of the union as a primary object of patriotic desire. Is there a doubt whether a common government can embrace so large a sphere? let experience solve it. To listen to mere speculation in such a case were criminal. We are authorized to hope that a proper organization of the whole, with the auxiliary agency of governments for the respective subdivisions, will afford a happy issue to the experiment. It is well worth a fair and full experiment. With such powerful and obvious motives to union, affecting all parts of our country, while experience shall not have demonstrated its impracticability, there will always be reason to distrust the patriotism of those who, in any quarter, may endeavor to weaken its bands.

In contemplating the causes which may disturb our Union, it occurs as matter of serious concern, that any ground should have been furnished for characterizing parties by geographical discriminations—*northern* and *southern*—*Atlantic* and *western*; whence designing men may endeavor to excite a belief that there is a real difference of local interests and views. One of the expedients of party to acquire influence within particular districts, is to misrepresent the opinions and aims of other districts. You cannot shield yourselves too much against the jealousies and heart burnings which spring from these misrepresentations; they tend to render alien to each other those who ought to be bound together by fraternal affection. The inhabitants of our western country have lately had a useful lesson on this head; they have seen, in the negotiation by the executive, and in the unanimous ratification by the senate of the treaty with Spain, and in the universal satisfaction at the event throughout the United States, a decisive proof how unfounded were the suspicions propagated among them of a policy in the general government and in the Atlantic states, unfriendly to their interests in regard to the Mississippi. They have been witnesses to the formation of two treaties, that with Great Britain and that

with Spain, which secure to them everything they could desire, in respect to our foreign relations, towards confirming their prosperity. Will it not be their wisdom to rely for the preservation of these advantages on the union by which they were procured? will they not henceforth be deaf to those advisers, if such they are, who would sever them from their brethren and connect them with aliens?

To the efficacy and permanency of your Union, a government for the whole is indispensable. No alliance, however strict, between the parts can be an adequate substitute; they must inevitably experience the infractions and interruptions which all alliances, in all times, have experienced. Sensible of this momentous truth, you have improved upon your first essay, by the adoption of a constitution of government, better calculated than your former, for an intimate union, and for the efficacious management of your common concerns. This government, the offspring of our own choice, uninfluenced and unawed, adopted upon full investigation and mature deliberation, completely free in its principles, in the distribution of its powers, uniting security with energy, and maintaining within itself a provision for its own amendment, has a just claim to your confidence and your support. Respect for its authority, compliance with its laws, acquiescence in its measures, are duties enjoined by the fundamental maxims of true liberty. The basis of our political systems is the right of the people to make and to alter their constitutions of government.—But the constitution which at any time exists, until changed by an explicit and authentic act of the whole people, is sacredly obligatory upon all. The very idea of the power and the right of the people to establish government, presupposes the duty of every individual to obey the established government.

All obstructions to the execution of the laws, all combinations and associations, under whatever plausible character, with the real design to direct, control, counteract, or awe the regular deliberations and action of the constituted authorities, are destructive of this fundamental principle, and of fatal tendency.—They serve to organize faction, to give it an artificial and extraordinary force, to put in the place of the delegated will of the nation the will of party, often a small but artful and enterprising minority of the community; and according to the alternate triumphs of different parties, to make the public administration the mirror of the ill concerted and incongruous projects of faction, rather than the organ of consistent and wholesome plans digested by common councils, and modified by mutual interests.

However combinations or associations of the above description may now and then answer popular ends, they are likely, in the course of time and things, to become potent engines, by which cunning, ambitious, and unprincipled men, will be enabled to subvert the power of the people, and to usurp for themselves

the reins of government; destroying afterwards the very engines which have lifted them to unjust dominion.

Towards the preservation of your government and the permanency of your present happy state it is requisite, not only, that you steadily discountenance irregular opposition to its acknowledged authority, but also that you resist with care the spirit of innovation upon its principles, however specious the pretext. One method of assault may be to effect, in the forms of the constitution, alterations which will impair the energy of the system; and thus to undermine what cannot be directly overthrown. In all the changes to which you may be involved, remember that time and habit are at least as necessary to fix the true character of governments, as of other human institutions:—that experience is the surest standard by which to test the real tendency of the existing constitution of a country:—that facility in changes, upon the credit of mere hypothesis and opinion, exposes to perpetual change from the endless variety of hypothesis and opinion: and remember, especially, that for the efficient management of your common interests in a country so extensive as ours, a government of as much vigor as is consistent with the perfect security of liberty is indispensable. Liberty itself will find in such a government with powers properly distributed and adjusted, its surest guardian. It is, indeed, little else than a name, where the government is too feeble to withstand the enterprises of faction, to confine each member of the society within the limits prescribed by the laws, and to maintain all in the secure and tranquil enjoyment of the rights of person and property.

I have already intimated to you the danger of parties in the state, with particular references to the founding of them on geographical discrimination. Let me now take a more comprehensive view, and warn you in the most solemn manner against the baneful effects of the spirit of party generally.

This spirit, unfortunately, is inseparable from our nature, having its root in the strongest passions of the human mind.—It exists under different shapes in all governments, more or less stifled, controlled, or repressed; but in those of the popular form it is seen in its greatest rankness, and is truly their worst enemy.

The alternate domination of one faction over another, sharpened by the spirit of revenge natural to party dissension, which in different ages and countries has perpetrated the most horrid enormities, is itself a frightful despotism. But this leads at length to a more formal and permanent despotism. The disorders and miseries which result, gradually incline the minds of men to seek security and repose in the absolute power of an individual; and, sooner or later, the chief of some prevailing faction, more able or more fortunate than his competitors, turns this disposition to the purpose of his own elevation on the ruins of public liberty.

Without looking forward to an extremity of this kind (which nevertheless ought not to be entirely out of sight) the common and continual mischiefs of the

spirit or party are sufficient to make it the interest and duty of a wise people to discourage and restrain it.

It serves always to distract the public councils, and enfeeble the public administration. It agitates the community with ill founded jealousies and false alarms; kindles the animosity of one part against another; foment occasional riot and insurrection. It opens the door to foreign influence and corruption, which finds a facilitated access to the government itself through the channels of party passions. Thus the policy and the will of one country are subjected to the policy and will of another.

There is an opinion that parties in free countries are useful checks upon the administration of the government, and serve to keep alive the spirit of liberty. This within certain limits is probably true; and in governments of a monarchical cast, patriotism may look with indulgence, if not with favor, upon the spirit of party. But in those of the popular character, in governments purely elective, it is a spirit not to be encouraged. From their natural tendency, it is certain there will always be enough of that spirit for every salutary purpose. And there being constant danger of excess, the effort ought to be, by force of public opinion, to mitigate and assuage it. A fire not to be quenched, it demands a uniform vigilance to prevent it bursting into a flame, lest instead of warming, it should consume.

It is important likewise, that the habits of thinking in a free country should inspire caution in those intrusted with its administration, to confine themselves within their respective constitutional spheres, avoiding in the exercise of the powers of one department, to encroach upon another. The spirit of encroachment tends to consolidate the powers of all the departments in one, and thus to create, whatever the form of government, a real despotism. A just estimate of that love of power and proneness to abuse it which predominate in the human heart, is sufficient to satisfy us of the truth of this position. The necessity of reciprocal checks in the exercise of political power, by dividing and distributing it into different depositories, and constituting each the guardian of the public weal against invasion of the others, has been evinced by experiments ancient and modern; some of them in our country and under our own eyes.—To preserve them must be as necessary as to institute them. If, in the opinion of the people, the distribution or modification of the constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way which the constitution designates.—But let there be no change by usurpation; for though this, in one instance, may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed. The precedent must always greatly overbalance in permanent evil any partial or transient benefit which the use can at any time yield.

Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports. In vain would that man claim the tribute of

patriotism, who should labor to subvert these great pillars of human happiness, these firmest props of the duties of men and citizens. The mere politician, equally with the pious man, ought to respect and to cherish them. A volume could not trace all their connections with private and public felicity. Let it simply be asked, Where is the security for property, for reputation, for life, if the sense of religious obligation desert the oaths which are the instruments of investigation in courts of justice? And let us with caution indulge the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion. Whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds of peculiar structure, reason and experience both forbid us to expect, that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle.

It is substantially true, that virtue or morality is a necessary spring of popular government. The rule, indeed, extends with more or less force to every species of free government. Who that is a sincere friend to it can look with indifference upon attempts to shake the foundation of the fabric?

Promote, then, as an object of primary importance, institutions for the general diffusion of knowledge. In proportion as the structure of a government gives force to public opinion, it should be enlightened.

As a very important source of strength and security, cherish public credit. One method of preserving it is to use it as sparingly as possible, avoiding occasions of expense by cultivating peace, but remembering, also, that timely disbursements, to prepare for danger, frequently prevent much greater disbursements to repel it; avoiding likewise the accumulation of debt, not only by shunning occasions of expense, but by vigorous exertions, in time of peace, to discharge the debts which unavoidable wars may have occasioned, not ungenerously throwing upon posterity the burden which we ourselves ought to bear. The execution of these maxims belongs to your representatives, but it is necessary that public opinions should cooperate. To facilitate to them the performance of their duty, it is essential that you should practically bear in mind, that towards the payment of debts there must be revenue; that to have revenue there must be taxes, that no taxes can be devised which are not more or less inconvenient and unpleasant; that the intrinsic embarrassment inseparable from the selection of the proper object (which is always a choice of difficulties), ought to be a decisive motive for a candid construction of the conduct of the government in making it, and for a spirit of acquiescence in the measures for obtaining revenue, which the public exigencies may at any time dictate.

Observe good faith and justice towards all nations; cultivate peace and harmony with all. Religion and morality enjoin this conduct, and can it be that good policy does not equally enjoin it? It will be worthy of a free, enlightened, and, at no distant period, a great nation, to give to mankind the magnanimous and too novel example of a people always guided

by an exalted justice and benevolence. Who can doubt but, in the course of time and things, the fruits of such a plan would richly repay any temporary advantages which might be lost by a steady adherence to it; can it be that Providence has not connected the permanent felicity of a nation with its virtue? The experiment, at least is recommended by every sentiment which ennobles human nature. Alas! is it rendered impossible by its vices?

In the execution of such a plan, nothing is more essential than that permanent, inveterate antipathies against particular nations and passionate attachments for others, should be excluded; and that in place of them, just and amicable feelings towards all should be cultivated. The nation which indulges towards another an habitual hatred, or an habitual fondness, is in some degree a slave. It is a slave to its animosity or to its affection, either of which is sufficient to lead it astray from its duty and its interest. Antipathy in one nation against another disposes each more readily to offer insult and injury, to lay hold of slight causes of umbrage, and to be haughty and intractable when accidental or trifling occasions of dispute occur. Hence, frequent collisions, obstinate, envenomed, and bloody contests. The nation, prompted by ill will and resentment, sometimes impels to war the government, contrary to the best calculations of policy. The government sometimes participates in the national propensity, and adopts through passion what reason would reject; at other times, it makes the animosity of the nation subservient to projects of hostility, instigated by pride, ambition, and other sinister and pernicious motives. The peace often, sometimes perhaps the liberty of nations, has been the victim.

So likewise, a passionate attachment of one nation for another produces a variety of evils. Sympathy for the favorite nation, facilitating the illusion of an imaginary common interest in cases where no real common interest exists, and infusing into one the enmities of the other, betrays the former into a participation in the quarrels and wars of the latter, without adequate inducements or justifications. It leads also to concessions, to the favorite nation, of privileges denied to others, which is apt doubly to injure the nation making the concessions, by unnecessary parting with what ought to have been retained, and by exciting jealousy, ill will, and a disposition to retaliate in the parties from whom equal privileges are withheld; and it gives to ambitious, corrupted or deluded citizens who devote themselves to the favorite nation, facility to betray or sacrifice the interests of their own country, without odium, sometimes even with popularity; gilding with the appearances of a virtuous sense of obligation, a commendable deference for public opinion, or a laudable zeal for public good, the base or foolish compliances of ambition, corruption, or infatuation.

As avenues to foreign influence in innumerable ways, such attachments are particularly alarming to the truly en-

lightened and independent patriot. How many opportunities do they afford to tamper with domestic factions, to practice the arts of seduction, to mislead public opinion, to influence or awe the public councils!—Such an attachment of a small or weak, towards a great and powerful nation, dooms the former to be the satellite of the latter.

Against the insidious wiles of foreign influence (I conjure you to believe me fellow citizens) the jealousy of a free people ought to be constantly awake; since history and experience prove, that foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of republican government. But that jealousy, to be useful, must be impartial, else it becomes the instrument of the very influence to be avoided, instead of a defense against it. Excessive partiality for one foreign nation and excessive dislike for another, cause those whom they actuate to see danger only on one side, and serve to veil and even second the arts of influence on the other. Real patriots, who may resist the intrigues of the favorite, are liable to become suspected and odious; while its tools and dupes usurp the applause and confidence of the people, to surrender their interest.

The great rule of conduct for us, in regard to foreign nations, is, in extending our commercial relations, to have with them as little political connection as possible. So far as we have already formed engagements, let them be fulfilled with perfect good faith:—Here let us stop.

Europe has a set of primary interests, which to us have none, or a very remote relation. Hence, she must be engaged in frequent controversies, the causes of which are essentially foreign to our concerns. Hence, therefore, it must be unwise in us to implicate ourselves, by artificial ties, in the ordinary vicissitudes of her politics, or the ordinary combinations and collusions of her friendships or enmities.

Our detached and distant situation invites and enables us to pursue a different course. If we remain one people, under an efficient government, the period is not far off when we may defy material injury from external annoyance; when we may take such an attitude as will cause the neutrality we may at any time resolve upon, to be scrupulously respected; when belligerent nations, under the impossibility of making acquisitions upon us, will not lightly hazard the giving us provocation, when we may choose peace or war, as our interest, guided by justice, shall counsel.

Why forego the advantages of so peculiar a situation? Why quit our own to stand upon foreign ground? Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalry, interest, humor, or caprice?

It is our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliance with any portion of the foreign world; so far, I mean, as we are now at liberty to do it; for let me not be understood as capable of patronizing infidelity to existing engagements. I hold the maxim no less applicable to

public than private affairs, that honesty is always the best policy. I repeat it, therefore, let those engagements be observed in their genuine sense. But in my opinion, it is unnecessary, and would be unwise to extend them.

Taking care always to keep ourselves by suitable establishments, on a respectable defensive posture, we may safely trust to temporary alliances for extraordinary emergencies.

Harmony, and a liberal intercourse with all nations, are recommended by policy, humanity, and interest. But even our commercial policy should hold an equal and impartial hand; neither seeking nor granting exclusive favors or preferences; consulting the natural course of things; diffusing and diversifying by gentle means the streams of commerce, but forcing nothing; establishing with powers so disposed, in order to give trade a stable course, to define the rights of our merchants, and to enable the government to support them, conventional rules of intercourse, the best that present circumstances and mutual opinion will permit, but temporary, and liable to be from time to time abandoned or varied as experience and circumstances shall dictate; constantly keeping in view, that it is folly in one nation to look for disinterested favors from another; that it must pay with a portion of its independence for whatever it may accept under that character; that by such acceptance, it may place itself in the condition of having given equivalents for nominal favors, and yet of being reproached with ingratitude for not giving more. There can be no greater error than to expect, or calculate upon real favors from nation to nation. It is an illusion which experience must cure, which a just pride ought to discard.

In offering to you, my countrymen, these counsels of an old and affectionate friend, I dare not hope they will make the strong and lasting impression I could wish; that they will control the usual current of the passions, or prevent our nation from running the course which has hitherto marked the destiny of nations, but if I may even flatter myself that they may be productive of some partial benefit, some occasional good; that they may now and then recur to moderate the fury of party spirit; to warn against the mischiefs of foreign intrigue, to guard against the impostures of pretended patriotism; this hope will be a full recompense for the solicitude for your welfare by which they have been dictated.

How far, in the discharge of my official duties, I have been guided by the principles which have been delineated, the public records and other evidences of my conduct must witness to you and to the world. To myself, the assurance of my own conscience is, that I have, at least, believed myself to be guided by them.

In relation to the still subsisting war in Europe; my proclamation of the 22d of April, 1793, is the index to my plan. Sanctioned by your approving voice, and by that of your representatives in both houses of congress, the spirit of that measure has continually governed me, uninfluenced by any attempts to deter or divert me from it.

After deliberate examination, with the aid of the best lights I could obtain, I was well satisfied that our country, under all the circumstances of the case, had a right to take, and was bound in duty and interest, to take a neutral position. Having taken it, I determined, as far as should depend upon me, to maintain it with moderation, perseverance and firmness.

The considerations which respect the right to hold this conduct, it is not necessary on this occasion to detail. I will only observe that, according to my understanding of the matter, that right, so far from being denied by any of the belligerent powers, has been virtually admitted by all.

The duty of holding a neutral conduct may be inferred, without anything more, from the obligation which justice and humanity impose on every nation, in cases in which it is free to act, to maintain inviolate the relations of peace and amity towards other nations.

The inducements of interest for observing that conduct will best be referred to your own reflections and experience. With me a predominant motive has been to endeavor to gain time to our country to settle and mature its yet recent institutions, and to progress, without interruption, to that degree of strength, and consistency which is necessary to give it, humanly speaking, the command of its own fortunes.

Though in reviewing the incidents of my administration, I am unconscious of intentional error, I am nevertheless too sensible of my defects not to think it probable that I may have committed many errors. Whatever they may be, I fervently beseech the Almighty to avert or mitigate the evils to which they may tend. I shall also carry with me the hope that my country will never cease to view them with indulgence; and that, after forty-five years of my life dedicated to its service, with an upright zeal, the faults of incompetent abilities will be consigned to oblivion, as myself must soon be to the mansions of rest.

Relying on its kindness in this as in other things, and actuated by that fervent love towards it, which is so natural to a man who views in it the native soil of himself and his progenitors for several generations; I anticipate with pleasing expectation that retreat in which I promise myself to realize without alloy, the sweet enjoyment of partaking, in the midst of my fellow citizens, the benign influence of good laws under a free government—the ever favorite object of my heart, and the happy reward, as I trust, of our mutual cares, labors and dangers.

GEO. WASHINGTON.

UNITED STATES,  
17th September, 1796.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, February 26, 1962, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1737. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States transmitting a report on review of the military assistance program (MAP) for Greece, as administered by the Joint U.S. Military Aid Group to Greece; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1738. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a report to the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House of Representatives pursuant to section 3 of the act of July 21, 1961, (75 Stat. 216, 217), and pursuant to rule XL of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOLAND:

H.R. 10355. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 10356. A bill to amend title I of the National Housing Act to provide that a home improvement loan may be the subject of insurance thereunder even though its maturity exceeds the specified limits if it is made for the purpose of financing the construction of a family fallout shelter; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H.R. 10357. A bill to provide for the settlement of claims against the United States by members of the uniformed services and civilian officers and employees of the United States for damage to, or loss of, personal property incident to their service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. DWYER:

H.R. 10358. A bill to amend section (9) (a) of the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 10359. A bill to provide that for the purpose of disapproval by the President each provision of an appropriation bill shall be considered a separate bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 10360. A bill to amend section 612(f) of title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Administrator to furnish medical services for non-service-connected disabilities to those veterans receiving or entitled to receive disability pension; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 10361. A bill to amend section 3011 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that the effective date of an award of increased compensation, dependency, and indemnity compensation, or pension shall be fixed in accordance with the facts found; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 10362. A bill to amend section 314 of title 38, United States Code, to authorize total disability compensation for veterans having the service-connected disability of deafness, both ears; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GOODELL:

H.R. 10363. A bill relating to the occupational training, development, and use of the manpower resources of the Nation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H.R. 10364. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deprecia-

tion deduction for the wear and tear of real property used as the taxpayers' principal residence; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KORNEGAY:

H.R. 10365. A bill to preserve wheat acreage history; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LIBONATI:

H.R. 10366. A bill to incorporate the Paralyzed Veterans of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

H.R. 10367. A bill to provide for the appointment of two additional judges for the juvenile court of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. QUIE:

H.R. 10368. A bill to limit the authority of the Commodity Credit Corporation to sell any farm commodity owned or controlled by it; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RANDALL:

H.R. 10369. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to increase the survivor annuity from 50 percent to 75 percent of the principal annuity in certain cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SHIPLEY:

H.R. 10370. A bill to increase from \$600 to \$1,000 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H.J. Res. 639. Joint resolution to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act, to promote quality and price stabilization, to define and restrain certain unfair methods of distribution and to confirm, define and equalize the rights of producers and resellers in the distribution of goods identified by distinguishing brands, names, or trademarks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. Con. Res. 437. Concurrent resolution to prohibit training military personnel or aiding Communist nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. Res. 550. Resolution condemning the growing anti-Semitism in Russia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

#### MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII:

The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to pass legislation that would transfer the present site and building of the Santa Fe Post Office, when it is declared surplus, to the State of New Mexico for the utilization of such site and building for a State museum, which was referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KORNEGAY:

H.R. 10371. A bill for the relief of Ferdinand A. Hermens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Iowa:

H.R. 10372. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Michele Amodeo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

# Homeowners Deserve a Much Better Plan Than the Department of Urban Affairs and Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS  
OF

HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1962

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, our homeowners deserve a much better plan than the Department of Urban Affairs and Housing sponsored by President Kennedy.

I am intensely interested in legislation which will help cities combat blight and enable the Federal Government to gain more tax revenue thereby over the long run.

The spreading blight of urban decay and obsolescence is far outrunning the ability of cities and the Federal Government to deal effectively with the problems involved.

I am not in favor of the Department of Urban Affairs and Housing because it would simply increase the huge sums now devoted to grandiose city-beautiful schemes involving yacht basins, luxury apartments starting at \$325 a month, parking lots at public expense disguised as slum-clearance programs, and downtown renewal schemes costing hundreds of millions of dollars.

Three - hundred-and-twenty-five-dollar-a-month luxury apartments are being provided in the Southwest urban renewal project, in Washington, D.C., in which the Federal Government has an investment of more than \$70 million.

Parking lots requiring the destruction of houses which would cost up to \$50,000 to \$75,000 each to replace are planned in the Adams-Morgan urban renewal project area. If there is one shred of evidence that 16th Street, Columbia Road, Lanier Place, and the Kalorama Triangle are slum areas—as claimed by the National Capital Planning Commission, and the Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia—then it should be brought forward for the entire Nation to examine.

Urban renewal schemes for the renovation of the Georgetown area of Washington, D.C., have been in the news for months. Georgetown is one of the most expensive areas in the entire country to live in. If it is a slum then this is news to its inhabitants.

These are the kind of plans which have gotten the administration's plans for a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing into trouble.

There are much better plans available.

President Eisenhower's Urban Renewal Commissioner, David M. Walker, once said that he firmly believed that tax considerations can stimulate a new industry of home improvements and repair, and that the Treasury, over the long run, would gain more revenue than it would lose.

Mr. Walker considered decay and obsolescence of American cities one of our Nation's most serious domestic problems.

Among other things, Mr. Walker recommended that, first, homeowners be allowed to deduct repair and maintenance expenses in the same way landlords can at the present time, and, second, individuals who are property owners be allowed to depreciate the cost of home improvements more rapidly as an incentive to home restoration and remodeling.

I have today introduced legislation which would provide individuals with an itemized income tax deduction for depreciation of their residences. Present law only permits a deduction for depreciation of property used in a trade or business or held for the production of income. These present deductions, which both individuals and corporations can take, are not changed by my new bill.

The National Association of Home Builders supports the depreciation approach embodied in my bill. In fact, the statement of policy for 1962 of the National Association of Home Builders, item IX, reads:

The annual depreciation in a home, through use, should be recognized by annual income tax deduction. We urge that homeowners be allowed to deduct annually an allowance for depreciation.

Ours is a representative form of government. The Congress has shown that there is little support for President Kennedy's plan to establish a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing.

If the President really believes in representative government then he should look into proposals such as the one I am introducing today. Certainly it is a plan which would be highly popular with all Americans.

More than 60 percent of American householders now own the homes they live in. My bill would greatly encourage homeownership.

There is nothing which would better demonstrate to the world the desirability of the American system over the Communist system than the proof that all of its citizens are homeowners.

The need for some recognition in the tax law of the wear and tear and obsolescence of a family dwelling has been obvious for some time. When a home is sold at a profit, taxable capital gain is realized; a loss is not recognized. A halfway step to alleviate the tax problem of the homeowner was taken in 1951 when a provision was added to the law postponing the tax on the gain produced by sale of a residence if a new residence is purchased or constructed by the homeowner within a specified period of time and if the new residence costs as much as the sales price of the old one. However, the tax on the gain was only postponed by the 1951 provision; it will be taxed if the homeowner sells his residence without buying or building a new one of equal or greater value, and the provisions of this bill would not affect either the post-

ponement or the ultimate taxability. As a matter of fact, since the depreciation deduction would reduce the tax basis, the ultimate capital gain subject to tax could only be increased.

Each homeowner would be permitted to deduct an amount each year computed by taking into account the cost—or other basis of the property—the useful life, and the salvage value of the property. If the residence were acquired by gift or by bequest, then the cost to the donor or decedent would be the basis of the property for depreciation. The useful life and the salvage value shall be matters subject to proof by the taxpayer, but the Internal Revenue Service will publish regulations to provide minimum reasonable allowance.

If in any year a homeowner declined to take the itemized deduction for depreciation, electing rather the standard deduction, then the basis of the property would still be reduced by the amount allowable to him. Likewise, the cost basis of a residence for the first year when a deduction is allowable, 1962, will be adjusted downward to take into account actual wear and tear sustained by the homeowner prior to that year.

A person has to be a homeowner to qualify for this deduction; a person renting his home will not receive the benefits quite correctly, since he has no capital investment in the property and loses nothing through wear and tear or obsolescence. A person holding the property for life, however, would be entitled to the deduction. Of course, equitable ownership, though the property is subject to a mortgage or deed of trust, will qualify for the deduction.

The text of my new bill, which carries out the policy of the National Association of Home Builders, follows:

H.R. —

Bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a depreciation deduction for the wear and tear of real property used as the taxpayer's principal residence

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) part VII of subchapter B of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to additional itemized deductions for individuals) is amended by redesignating section 217 as section 218 and by inserting after section 216 the following new section:

"SEC. 217. DEPRECIATION OF RESIDENCE.

"(a) GENERAL RULE.—There shall be allowed as a depreciation deduction in the case of a taxpayer who is an individual a reasonable allowance for the exhaustion, wear and tear (including a reasonable allowance for obsolescence) of property owned by him and used as his principal residence.

"(b) PROPER METHOD.—The term 'reasonable allowance' as used in subsection (a) shall include (but shall not be limited to) an allowance computed in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate, under the straight line method.

"(c) BASIS FOR DEPRECIATION.—The basis on which exhaustion, wear and tear, and obsolescence are to be allowed shall be the adjusted basis provided in section 1011 for the purpose of determining the gain on the sale or other disposition of such property,

except that (1) the basis of a residence or any part thereof acquired from a decedent within the meaning of section 1014(b), or acquired by gift, shall be the same as it would be in the hands of the decedent or the donor, as the case may be, or the last owner by whom it was not acquired from a decedent or by gift, and (2) the basis, however determined, shall be reduced by an adjustment for exhaustion, wear and tear, and obsolescence to the extent sustained prior to January 1, 1962, either by the taxpayer or any decedent or donor with respect to whose basis the taxpayer's basis is determined.

"(d) OWNERSHIP.—For the purpose of applying subsection (a), a principal residence shall be deemed owned by the taxpayer if legal or beneficial ownership of the property is in the taxpayer. In the case of property held by one individual for life with remainder to another individual, the deduction shall be computed as if the life tenant were the absolute owner of the property and shall be allowed to the life tenant. In the case of property held in trust or in an estate, the depreciation deduction under this section shall be allowed to the individual who by the terms of the trust instrument, will, or law of succession is permitted to occupy the property and who, in fact, uses the property as his principal residence."

(b) The table of sections for such part VII is amended by striking out

"SEC. 217. CROSS REFERENCES."

and inserting in lieu thereof

"SEC. 217. DEPRECIATION OF RESIDENCE.

"SEC. 218. CROSS REFERENCES."

(c) The amendments made by this Act shall apply only with respect to taxable years ending after the date of the enactment of this Act.

### Legislation Introduced for Two Additional Juvenile Court Judges in the District of Columbia

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.**

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1962

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced legislation today that will provide two additional judges for the juvenile court in the District of Columbia. The bill which I have introduced is similar to the proposal which was approved by the Senate last year.

The House is scheduled to consider the measures dealing with the problems facing the juvenile court on Monday, February 26. I hope that at that time the House will approve the legislation which I have introduced today.

I have introduced this measure to add two judges to the juvenile court after a complete discussion with metropolitan area community leaders and a complete study of the various proposals to remedy the problems caused by the huge backlog of juvenile cases. I believe that the best method of solving this problem is to strengthen the present court rather than transfer its functions to another court.

The current backlog of over 2,000 cases now pending in the juvenile court has provided the District of Columbia with one of its most serious social problems. The approval of this bill would reduce

the time between apprehension and trial from 15 weeks to 5 days. The present delay in hearing juvenile cases is one cause of delinquency that can be remedied immediately by the Congress.

The plan which I have introduced is supported by the Judicial Conference of the District of Columbia, the District of Columbia Bar Association and the Washington Bar Association as well as many other civic leaders.

### House Resolution 543 To Authorize the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce To Conduct an Investigation and Study of the Adequacy of the Regulation of Nonscheduled Airlines

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1962

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, when I introduced House Resolution 543 on February 12, 1962, I stated its purpose is to direct the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to make an intensive review of the manner in which the Civil Aeronautics Board and the Federal Aviation Agency have regulated the nonscheduled airline industry. It is my belief, based on the evidence before our special subcommittee of the House Committee on Armed Services, as well as my own investigations, that the Imperial Airlines accident is attributable to the loose regulation of these carriers by the CAB and the FAA, as well as the poor management of the carrier.

In view of the magnitude of our scheduled air carrier industry, I am not persuaded that there was a demonstrated need for these nonscheduled certificates, and in holding them illegal, the court of appeals disagreed with the CAB, too, in many respects. However, I realize that the present Board inherited this problem from its predecessors. In fairness to all concerned, I should point out that throughout the history of the nonscheduled problem, present CAB member Chan Gurney and his former associate, Col. Harmar Denny, of my own State of Pennsylvania, consistently urged caution in the issuance of the nonscheduled certificates and voted for enforcement penalties and sanctions against those who violated regulations. The CAB has leaned over backward to resolve all doubts about certifications, certificate renewal, hidden control, and inadequate financial responsibility, and managerial ability in favor of the nonscheduled instead of in favor of the public. Following the Board's ill-advised actions in issuing these certificates and in failing to revoke them when knowledge of their inadequate financial responsibility or questionable managerial fitness came to its attention, the problem then shifted to the FAA.

Here again I realize the present Administrator inherited a problem in trying

to keep up with the fitness of these marginal carriers.

It is quite obvious that an undue number of hours have been required on the part of FAA personnel to determine the fitness of the equipment, personnel and operations of these nonscheduled carriers. I agree with the majority's conclusion that the Imperial Airlines accident could have been prevented. I agree with the majority's conclusion that there has been inadequate attention given to the managerial capacity and financial responsibility of these carriers. I agree with the majority's conclusion that any doubt concerning legal authority of CAB and FAA should have been resolved in favor of the public interest rather than the industry, particularly where economic factors affecting safety are concerned.

But I would go further. My question is why this situation has been allowed to continue. Why the CAB and the FAA have not used all of the legal authority that they presently have to eliminate the incompetent or unfit operators, and if they do not have adequate authority to accomplish this, why have they not asked the Congress for such additional authority as they may need to deal with this situation.

I cannot help wondering how many potential Imperials there may be in the supplemental industry in view of: (a) Administrator Halaby's testimony in reference to supplemental carriers that "there are good ones and not so good ones"; (b) the admitted failure of either CAB or FAA to evaluate adequately the management and financial resources of supplemental airlines; and (c) testimony of MATS that they have found a substantial number of carriers not qualified for military traffic. I certainly feel the general public is as entitled to safe air transportation as is the military. There is too much evidence that this is not always the case today.

Both the CAB and FAA told the subcommittee they were conducting extensive investigations of these carriers. What have been the results of the investigations? What changes should be made in the legislation now pending before the Congress to bring this industry under proper control? We should insist before final action is taken on this legislation that it eliminate all possibility of incompetent, poorly financed or poorly run operators. In this connection, it is my opinion that the interim certificate authority may not be adequate to accomplish this. Why should the Congress direct the Board to give interim certificates to carriers which the Board's own findings might show are unfit, unsafe, or otherwise incompetent? Let us give the CAB and FAA authority to cut off the carriers that have filed false reports, that have operated in defiance or violation of Federal law and regulation, whose control may have come into the hands of persons whom the Board presently considers unfit. And for the future, if the Congress contemplates setting up a permanent class of supplemental carriers, let us make sure that the initial certificate standards are high, and that doubts as to the public need

for fitness or ability of these applicants is resolved in favor of the public and not in the private interest.

With that in mind, I sincerely hope that my resolution, House Resolution No. 543, will receive favorable consideration and thereby direct the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to review the CAB and FAA to determine the adequacy of the regulation of nonscheduled airlines.

### We Must Lead

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1962

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, these words from Washington's Farewell Address come ringing down through the years, holding important counsel for us in 1962. Today we celebrate the birthday of George Washington, whose armies loosened us from the bonds of foreign domination and—as our first President—launched us on the mighty course of a sovereign state. Here are his words:

Against the insidious wiles of foreign influence \* \* \* the jealousy of a free people ought to be constantly awake, since history and experience prove that foreign influence is one of the baneful foes of republican government.

During our development as the strongest and most progressive Nation in history, Americans have had to adjust to a changing world, a world so outwardly different from Washington's that to even compare them is to mock time itself. Even so, the unchangeable principles upon which our Republic was founded remain to guide us today when we are inextricably entwined in a larger, more complex world.

Washington's warning about the dangers of foreign influence is a guideline for present U.S. foreign policy. We must participate in the world; our history and our destiny demand that we lead as well. Washington's words that foreign influence must not divert U.S. policy—a policy which reflects the position of the United States—is as important in this age as it was in our first President's era.

A republican form of government is as sturdy as the maintenance of the sovereignty upon which it was built. Our hallmark is freedom and our challenge lies in the exertion of leadership as freemen. It is for this reason that the United States has not only inherited—but earned—its position as leader against the forces of tyranny and oppression.

All too often we have allowed ourselves to become submerged in a puddle of international wishy-washiness. A clear U.S. foreign policy, anchored by its force as the free world's leader, has subsequently become diluted. It is essential that today, recalling Washington's apt reflection, we secure our proper and vital role in assuming the leadership of freemen everywhere.

### Amendment of Juvenile Court Act

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. J. CARLTON LOSER**

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1962

Mr. LOSER. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Subcommittee on the District of Columbia that considered and reported favorably H.R. 6747, amending the Juvenile Court Act of the District of Columbia, I heartily join with the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the Honorable JAMES C. DAVIS of Georgia, in support of the Juvenile Court Act for the District.

The crimes of violence that have been committed over a period of years by juveniles under the age of 18 is startling. As a matter of fact, between July 1, 1959, and April 1, 1960, there were more crimes committed by juveniles of the ages of 16 and 17 than there were between the ages of 18 and 20.

Mr. Speaker, it is my considered opinion that the District of Columbia Committee has done an outstanding job in reporting H.R. 6747 to the House for its consideration. My experience in the prosecution of criminal cases in Tennessee covers a period of more than a quarter of a century, and as a result of this experience in dealing with crime I have come to a definite conclusion as to the method that should be used in combating crime. I do not believe there is a greater deterrent to antisocial conduct more effective than the certainty of apprehension, together with a speedy trial and adequate punishment.

Mr. Speaker, I was astounded to learn when I sat in on these hearings that juveniles charged with the crimes of rape and murder under the age of 18 could be tried in a juvenile court. In my State of Tennessee, our juvenile courts have no jurisdiction whatsoever in rape and murder cases, regardless of the age of the accused. Our statute in Tennessee creating the juvenile court specifically provides that persons charged with these serious offenses are to be tried in a court enjoying general jurisdiction in criminal cases.

Mr. Speaker, Judge DAVIS, the subcommittee chairman, has been most diligent in these hearings, and I believe that should H.R. 6747 become the law here in the District it will operate as a great deterrent.

It is shameful that in the Capital City of the Nation so many crimes of violence have been committed by juveniles that the police department had to issue a set of instructions to Washingtonians who traverse the streets here after dark. The police department even suggested that persons in an automobile who were approached by a suspicious looking person, immediately move off rapidly even if it means running a red light. I was shocked to learn that five women were ravished in 4 days in the middle of 1961 and that four of the rapes were committed within 13 hours. It is a matter of common knowledge that rapes and as-

saults have been committed in the daytime and at night on the streets and in homes and, upon occasion, even in business establishments.

I believe it would be manifestly in the public interest that the jurisdiction of the juvenile court, in handling youth offenders, should be reduced from 18 to 16 years.

The Metropolitan Police Department of the District of Columbia has an unusually effective leader in Chief Robert V. Murray, and his Department has been doing a splendid job under adverse circumstances. Here in the District we have nearly 3,000 policemen, and 50 police dogs have been secured and trained and are now assisting in patrolling this area.

Mr. Speaker, I am not greatly concerned whether the court hearing juvenile cases is called a juvenile court, or whether it is a branch within the municipal court. What this District needs is an additional judge to promptly hear and determine cases within his jurisdiction. I believe that H.R. 6747, if given a trial, will effectively meet the needs of this community at the present time. If it should develop that additional judges, other than the two provided for in the bill, are needed, the Congress can act promptly on the matter.

Mr. Speaker, suffice it to say that I heartily support the measure, as reported by the District Committee, and hope that it will receive favorable action by the House.

### Estonian Independence Day

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND**

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1962

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the year 1918 saw the end of the bloodiest and costliest war the world had known until that time. Belligerents and neutrals alike were glad to see that human carnage stop and they all welcomed the return of peace. To some people 1918 ushered in a new era; it brought them a prize for which they had been fighting for generations and even for centuries. In that year they regained their national independence and freedom. Estonians were among these people.

The Estonian people had settled in their historic land long before our era. There in a northerly outpost of Europe they led a quiet and contented, but strenuous and hardy life. They constituted one of the smallest and most homogenous ethnic groups in Europe, seldom numbering more than 1 million souls. But they succeeded in maintaining their national identity, their distinct national traits and characteristics, and their love for freedom. In the year 1710 their country was overrun by the Russians and they were forced to accept the autocratic regime imposed upon them. For more than 200 years they lived

under Russian oppression and they never liked it. Their chief desire during all that time was to be free, but they were unable to attain their freedom without help from others. Events in the course of the First World War worked in their favor. When the czarist regime in Russia was overthrown, that Government's rule over other nationalities was shattered. Then Estonians felt free, and on February 24 of 1918 they proclaimed their independence.

That was exactly 44 years ago, and unfortunately the new and independent Estonia born on that day ceased to exist very early in the last war. Since then unhappy Estonians are suffering under Communist totalitarianism, but their hope for freedom and their desire for independence is not diminished. These ideals still live in their hearts and minds; and they still cling to them as steadfastly as did their forefathers while suffering under czarist oppression. Their friends join them in the celebration of the 44th anniversary of their independence day and hope that they will again attain their cherished goal, freedom and independence.

### The Resurgence of Anti-Semitism in Russia

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. CHARLES A. BUCKLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1962

Mr. BUCKLEY. Mr. Speaker, in recent articles appearing in the New York Times and in the New York Herald Tribune I have read with keen interest and a deep sense of personal distaste of the resurgence of anti-Semitism in Russia. This anti-Semitism is a milder form than that which existed in the days of the pogroms. Jews are not being executed or shipped off to Siberia, but nonetheless anti-Semitism in a more subtle but vicious form is prevalent in many parts of the Soviet Union today.

Nine years ago on the floor of this House I spoke out against the brutal Soviet policy of anti-Semitism which then existed in Russia and I do so again today. I believe it is my duty to speak out here on behalf of these oppressed people to once again ask that action be taken to place this country on record as opposing this evil.

I think the remarks that I made 9 years ago are just as pertinent today. At that time I said:

I am gravely concerned and deeply shocked at the wave of anti-Semitism in Russia. The General Assembly of the United Nations has convened again. As a Member of Congress, I strongly urge that the United States, through its delegates to the United Nations, take speedy action to bring these Communist outrages against the Jews before the United Nations to help stop these inhuman acts which are so patently a violation of fundamental human rights.

We must immediately denounce growing anti-Semitism in the Communist

world and see that the free governments and the United Nations vigorously protest against it. The persecution and killing of Jewish people behind the Iron Curtain are part of the planned Communist campaign to enslave the entire free world. The Soviet Union must not be permitted to carry out their horrible practices as Hitler did. The free world must never forget the merciless slaughter of 6 million Jews by Hitler and his Nazi henchmen.

The Kremlin's assault and persecution of the Jewish people make it quite clear that the Moscow terror has for its real target the eradication of religion itself. As an American and of Catholic faith, I have always fought against and condemned race hatred and intolerance against minorities. I have always maintained that whenever one religious group suffers persecution, no other religious group is assured of immunity therefrom. When Jewish rights and liberties are trampled upon, likewise Catholic and Protestant rights and liberties are gravely endangered.

The arrests of Catholic priests and the brutalities inflicted upon them and the grave harm and injustices done to the Catholic Church behind the Iron Curtain are a pattern now extended to the Jewish people. The atrocities committed by Russia against such outstanding prelates of the Catholic Church as Cardinal Mindszenty and Archbishop Stepinac and others have already aroused the conscience of the free world and clearly show that Russia wants to enslave freemen everywhere. The closing of the borders by the Kremlin prevent the Jewish victims from leaving the Iron Curtain to seek shelter and refuge in the democratic State of Israel and elsewhere, and heaps cruelty upon cruelty.

The United States has always been the torchbearer of freedom and democracy. We have been and must continue to be the beacon light in the free world. The moral weight of the United States must be brought to bear against this anti-Semitism by Russia. I firmly believe that the United States and our representatives in the United Nations should strongly condemn the anti-Jewish policy of the Kremlin. I urge that appropriate action be taken forthwith. I am submitting herewith a resolution to the House of Representatives and ask that my distinguished colleagues unanimously join with me in adopting same. The resolution reads as follows:

Whereas the entire free world is deeply concerned over the growing anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union; and

Whereas the campaign of hate and persecution now being conducted against the Jewish people behind the Iron Curtain is abhorrent to all free peoples and increases the threat to the religious freedom of all free peoples; and

Whereas the people of the United States, true to their tradition and heritage, vigorously condemn bigotry and race hatred and strongly believe in freedom of religion and in all the fundamental rights of man; and

Whereas it is appropriate that the House of Representatives place itself on record by denouncing and opposing the growing anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives hereby expresses its profound sense of indignation and shock at the growing anti-Semitism and the campaign of hate and persecution being conducted against the Jewish people in the Soviet Union.

Sec. 2. (a) The President is requested to convey to the Soviet Union an expression of the grave concern of the people of the United States over this growing anti-Semitism, and to seek assurances that prompt and appropriate action will be taken to stop all forms of bigotry and race hatred against the Jewish people now living in the Soviet Union.

(b) The President is further requested to urge the Soviet Union to allow all Jewish persons within their borders who desire to do so to emigrate and to seek refuge and salvation in Israel and other free lands.

Sec. 3. The President is requested to take all possible immediate steps, through the United States delegation to the United Nations, to bring before the United Nations and before the bar of world opinion the facts about the cruel mistreatment of Jewish people living within the Soviet Union, to the end that such mistreatment shall cease.

### Cooley Supports President's Action on Barter

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1962

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, in the Washington Post of February 12 there was a news story quoting a Member of Congress, one of my distinguished colleagues, as charging the President with inconsistency for permitting barter transactions under Public Law 480 while at the same time calling for a review and possible reduction of the Nation's strategic stockpile. With all deference to the gentleman, may I say that I believe he is confused about the basic purposes of the Nation's stockpiling programs and should familiarize himself with the laws enacted by Congress before commenting on the President's action.

The President's reference in his recent press conference was to the so-called strategic or national stockpile which is established under the authority of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stockpiling Act. Its purpose is to acquire and stockpile materials which will be needed by this country in the event of war. The requirements of that stockpile have been changed from time to time as our military strategists have modified and modernized their conception of the type of war in which the United States might be forced to engage.

The other stockpile is the supplemental stockpile which was established by the Agricultural Act of 1956 to hold for future use materials which are acquired under the barter program authorized and directed in Public Law 480, which was enacted in 1954. The basic purpose of this program is to obtain something of permanent value to the United States in exchange for surplus agricultural commodities which cannot be sold abroad for cash—and thus protecting the

investment of the taxpayers of the United States in materials which are acquired under our agricultural price support program.

I do not know the full details of the particular transaction referred to by my colleague, but I do know that neither the President of the United States nor anyone else has made a mistake in taking such materials in exchange for our surplus agricultural commodities and I believe that the transactions to which the gentleman referred complied in all respects with the policies laid down by the Congress for such exchanges.

The Congress, by its enactment of Public Law 480, established various methods to reduce our agricultural surpluses and at the same time assure our country of receiving as much return as possible from these surpluses to offset the cost of our farm program. The Congress recognized that it was impossible for us to reduce our surpluses solely through the sale of commodities for dollars and therefore directed in Public Law 480 that in addition to selling for dollars or for short-term dollar credit, these commodities be sold for soft currencies, that they be donated outright in certain cases, that they be exchanged for strategic or other materials, and that they be sold on a long-term dollar credit basis.

Subsequently, the Congress specifically established priorities for these various types of disposals. We have told the executive branch that they should give preference first, to the sales for dollars; second, to short-term credit; third, the exchange of our commodities for materials of which the United States does not produce its requirements, which are not perishable, and which are cheaper to store; fourth, long-term dollar credit; and last, sales for soft currencies.

I particularly call the language of the law to the attention of my colleague because the barter transactions for lead and zinc to which he referred clearly fall within the law and the directives given by Congress to the executive branch.

First, I am informed that the United States produces only about 70 percent of the quantity of lead and zinc which is consumed annually in the United States and that our known lead and zinc deposits are gradually being used up. As to the second requirement, perishability, I am informed that lead and zinc can be stored in the open on military reservations and other Government property for generations with no deterioration whatever. In contrast, the wheat and corn which were exchanged for the lead will stay in condition only a few years even under the best possible enclosed storage conditions, and soon lose their value completely.

Third, with respect to the cost of storage, Government figures show that it costs about 12 cents a year to store a ton of lead, whereas it costs approximately \$4.50 a year to store a ton of wheat or \$4.82 a year to store a ton of corn in approved commercial storage. To put it another way, a ton of lead could be stored for approximately 2,000 years before the storage charges would equal the

value of the material. On the other hand, studies by the Department of Agriculture show that the value of a ton of grain will be eaten up by storage, handling, and carrying charges in less than 5 years, so that within this period the value of the bushel of grain, or a ton of grain, is reduced to zero. Each year the savings in storage and deterioration losses on the counterpart wheat or corn given in exchange for the lead the gentlemen referred to will provide sufficient revenue to store the lead for a period of more than 250 years.

An even more interesting example, Mr. Speaker, is in the case of industrial diamonds. This is one of the materials for which the President has authorized the exchange of our agricultural surpluses. The United States produces virtually no industrial diamonds but we use approximately 80 percent of the world's output. The volume of this need for industrial diamonds in our highly industrialized economy is increasing yearly and we must depend upon foreign sources for virtually all our requirements. I am informed that industrial diamonds valued at \$100 million can be stored and insured for less than \$1,500 per year. When we exchange perishable wheat or corn for imperishable industrial diamonds, 1 year's savings in the storage and deterioration loss on the wheat and corn will provide sufficient revenue to store industrial diamonds for more than 10,000 years before we have exhausted the savings.

To me, Mr. Speaker, no part of our agricultural export program makes more sense than this program of exchanging perishable and costly to store agricultural surpluses for nonperishable materials which we do not produce in sufficient quantity in the United States to meet our requirements and which can be stored at very little cost.

I must admit that I do not understand the reasoning of those who claim that we can have too much of any of these materials. How can we possibly have too much of a nonrenewable natural resource which is absolutely indispensable to our industrial economy? Does anyone contend that we have too much oil? That we have too much iron ore? That we have too much natural gas? How, then, can it be assumed that we have too much of any other nonrenewable natural resource, particularly those which are indispensable to our economy and which are not even produced in the United States?

How can we possibly have in storage in this country too many industrial diamonds, too much chrome, too much manganese, too much palladium—materials which we must have for our national survival and for which we must depend for our supplies upon nations which may or may not always be friendly to the United States and willing to sell these materials to us? Suppose it is 300 years before we need the lead which we acquired by bartering corn and wheat last summer. When we need it the lead will be there, and the cost of storing it for that period of time will be infinitesimal compared to the cost of storing the agricultural commodities we have ex-

changed for it, or compared to the benefits to be derived to the United States from the mere fact that we have it available for use when we need it.

To put it succinctly, Mr. Speaker, under this program we are exchanging national liabilities for national assets.

The mere existence of these metals and other materials in the United States is a national asset and there is no reason whatever to assume that the Government, which owns these materials, cannot manage them to the best interest of private industry and the Nation as a whole. Much of our indigenous natural resources, many oil and gas reserves, many of our mineral reserves are the property of the Government—and I have seldom heard any complaint that these resources are not being managed by the Government in the best interests of the United States. There is no more reason to assume that reserves which we stockpile in exchange for perishable agricultural commodities will not be managed, likewise, in the best interests of all of the people of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress has repeatedly examined into the reasons why the previous administration practically eliminated the barter program in early 1957. Prior to that time, the program was functioning smoothly and we had received virtually no complaints about its operation. We had moved more than a billion dollars worth of surplus agricultural commodities into the markets of the free world and had received in exchange materials which not only met the criteria established by the law, but which according to the information supplied by the Department of Agriculture had actually appreciated in value since their acquisition. Materials for which we exchanged approximately \$1 billion worth of surplus agricultural commodities under barter transactions were worth approximately \$1,100 million in 1959 when the Committee on Agriculture conducted its most extensive examination of this program.

Obviously, the Congress knew what it was doing when it passed the so-called barter law to which our colleague takes exception. However, he might be pleased to know that he is joined in this view by some individuals in the State Department who do not believe that we should get value returned for our surplus agricultural commodities but that we should use them only for give-away purposes in an international welfare program.

The position of those who have opposed the barter program directed by Congress is that such exchanges have interfered with cash sales of our agricultural commodities. It is rather clear, however, to those of us who have followed this program carefully that the real basis of opposition is that this program has made U.S. agricultural commodities competitive in markets where they would not otherwise be able to compete. They have not interfered with our cash sales but with the sales of other countries, many of which are conducted on precisely the same barter and bilateral basis to which they find objection in our own exports. Mr. Speaker, it is not necessary for me to repeat here the

many arguments that have been advanced and the reports rendered on both sides of the Congress in support of the barter program. I do state categorically that based on our committee investigations and the actions taken by the Congress we believe that disposals through the barter program have actually helped sales for dollars because of the linking of certain aspects of the commercial transactions and because they have actually made our commodities competitive on a world market. It must be remembered that both the surplus commodities and the incoming materials flow through normal trade channels and regardless of the use of the word "barter" they are handled as any other commercial transactions.

The testimony of Government witnesses before our committee has been crystal clear that prices paid by exporters for the agricultural commodities is exactly the same as if they had been purchased for cash and the prices paid for the materials which are received in exchange are at or below the prevailing market prices. Further, statistics given us by Department of Agriculture witnesses showed that as barter increased so did our sales for cash and when barter was curtailed our cash sales dropped off even more.

I, for one, my committee, and the Congress have clearly stated time and again that it is much better to receive hard diamonds or manganese in exchange for our surplus agricultural commodities than soft currencies, most of which we immediately donate back to the recipient country in the form of grants or soft loans which will probably never be repaid. As the Members of Congress individually may or may not know, it is now the current procedure of the executive branch to make sales for foreign currencies on a basis which returns approximately 75 percent of the foreign currency received to the country of destination in the form of long-term loans which will probably never be repaid. When it is remembered that on these transactions the United States pays in dollars not only the cost of the agricultural commodities but also the ocean shipping charges, it has been calculated by those who are familiar with this subject that we are receiving a return of approximately 6 percent to the American taxpayer on these commodities which are sold for foreign currencies. On commodities which are bartered for materials we will need in the future, we are receiving a return of approximately 100 percent and the ocean transportation is paid by the contractor who provides the materials.

Mr. Speaker, I think the record is clear that the Committee on Agriculture and the Congress have never refused to give the administration any authority it requested to donate our surplus agricultural commodities without compensation to other nations of the world in order to facilitate our foreign relations program. We have made available without compensation all of the stocks of the Commodity Credit Corporation which the administration has told us could effectively be used in promoting our foreign

relations. The only request we have made is that before we give these commodities away we do our best to obtain for American taxpayers and for this country as much actual return in value as we are able to do. This is the only request which we make now. It is the reason for the barter program. It is one way in which we can get something of value for the United States and for the American taxpayer in return for our agricultural surpluses.

So far as I am personally concerned, Mr. Speaker, and although I can speak only for myself, I believe that I reflect the sentiment of the whole Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives, I intend to insist that every effort be made to obtain something of value for the United States for our agricultural surpluses before they are given away. As far as I am concerned I do not intend to vote for one single additional bit of authority for foreign donation of our agricultural surpluses as long as arbitrary roadblocks are being put in the way of exchanging our commodities or selling them for something of real value to the United States. When I am convinced that every effort is being made to obtain for the American taxpayer as great a return as is possible for our surplus agricultural commodities, then I will be willing to go along with proposals to donate abroad as much of the rest of the surplus as can be used effectively to relieve hunger and hardship.

I have been greatly encouraged by the fact that the Secretary of Agriculture has carefully studied this problem and is currently planning to issue new directives designed to assure a greater use of this disposal method. I am further encouraged to believe that this position is supported by our Chief Executive.

On the other hand, we are disturbed by stories that notwithstanding the wording of the law and its clear intent, there still remains some residual opposition from the same staff levels that sponsored opposition to the barter program in the past administration. The Congress is convinced that this is a sound program of which we should make maximum utilization. The law on this point is clear. We agree that the program needs to be most carefully administered in the future as it has been in the past to avoid either overstimulating foreign production or creating artificial shortages in world supply. I have heard no criticism of the failure of the Department of Agriculture to do this in the past.

My distinguished colleague seemed to feel that the barter transaction to which he referred was adversely affecting domestic producers of lead in his district. I am certain that he did not know, or if he did, he failed to recognize the import of the fact, that not only was this particular transaction in strict accordance with the law and the intent of the Congress but was used as a tool to get an agreement from the foreign suppliers of this particular lead to cut back their production by 10 percent. Furthermore, it reduced surpluses of lead hanging over the market which were equally depressing world and domestic prices.

Nature has seen fit to give us the soil and the climate, which, when coupled with our technical and production methods, make us the greatest producer of agricultural commodities in the world. In order to keep our farm industry we have properly established farm programs which in part have created our commodity surpluses. On the other hand, we are a have-not nation for many of the metals and minerals without which our industry cannot function.

If we can take our agricultural surpluses and through normal trade channels secure national resources which every study made indicates we will need in our future economy and at the same time reduce our storage costs and losses by deterioration, I feel that we have a national program which is good by the standards of any reasonable man.

If this is not a good program, if there is anything evil about taking something of value in return for our perishable surplus agricultural commodities, then, Mr. Speaker, I believe that the time has come to repeal the law in its entirety. All evidence points to the desirability of the program. But the law should either be carried out or repealed, and I am confident that the President will see that the law is carried out.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform the House that I have requested Congressman JONES, one of our most able and outstanding committee members, through his Subcommittee on Departmental Oversight and Consumer Relations, to make a study as to the present status of the barter program. I have directed him to make a particular effort to analyze and make public the sources of opposition to the program and the bases for this opposition. I believe that this study will prove to be illuminating and helpful, and if, as I understand to be true, we have had in the meantime an announcement as to a revised program to make greater use of the barter method of disposing of surpluses, the subcommittee can judge the effectiveness of the changed program. Certainly we need to accurately determine the value that our country is receiving from the surplus commodities disposed of through this method to reassure ourselves that this value supports our present faith in the program.

### Public Law 87-362: A Fitting Tribute to George Washington

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1962

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, today we pay homage to the soldier statesman who, because of his great and heroic efforts in behalf of this Nation rightly earned the designation, "Father of Our Country."

On this commemoration of the birthday of George Washington, the 87th Con-

gress may take pardonable pride in its recent efforts to further protect the Nation's most beloved shrine of Mount Vernon. Last year, Mount Vernon was about to experience a serious onslaught of commercial urbanization. The shores opposite Mount Vernon have been maintained to date, much as they were in the time of George Washington. Not only has this been of significant historical consequence, but it has been an inseparable part of the character and setting of Mount Vernon, and this view from the veranda of the mansion has thrilled and inspired the citizenry of our country and foreign dignitaries alike. When the threat to establish a sewage treatment plant on the Maryland shores of the Potomac, directly across from Mount Vernon, was apparent, the Congress of the United States acted swiftly and decisively. The Congress enacted Public Law 87-362, which authorized the Federal Government to acquire the land opposite Mount Vernon for preservation in keeping with its original open and wooded character.

The overwhelming support of this measure by the Congress offers proof, beyond the words of praise, of the feeling the citizens of this country, and their elected representatives, have for the memory of George Washington.

This body has been extremely fortunate over the years to have the very capable counsel and leadership in the area of natural resources of the chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, the gentleman from Colorado, Mr. WAYNE ASPINALL. In learning of this threat, he introduced legislation to protect properly the environs of Mount Vernon. He was joined in this leadership by the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on National Parks, Mr. RUTHERFORD. These men were acutely aware of the need for fast action, if Mount Vernon was to receive adequate protection. During the committee's deliberation it became apparent that the preservation of this area heretofore had been achieved through planning and sacrifice by individual citizens. Private covenants were established to maintain the character of the area. Local government cooperation was asked, and plans were effected to establish zoning to the end of preservation. In addition, regional organizations, charged with the overall planning and coordination of the other areas of Metropolitan Washington, cooperated in urging that the area be kept in an open or park status. The State of Maryland had initiated standards to achieve the preservation of these lands. These activities have continued for over 15 years—activities that were manifested in good government by private citizens and local authorities. Unfortunately, the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission had wide powers of condemnation and eminent domain granted to it by the State, and the groups, both private and governmental, that labored so long were unable to restrain the sanitary commission from their plans of establishing a sewage treatment plant opposite George Washington's front porch. The Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission held hearings over a year ago, on Janu-

ary 13, 1961, in which the majority of the affected landowners, in addition to national conservation and historic societies vigorously objected to these plans and procedures. On August 17, 1961, the Subcommittee on National Parks, under the chairmanship of the distinguished Congressman from Texas, held hearings on the measures introduced to afford Federal protection to these areas. In the course of these hearings, it became apparent that there were other locations that could better serve the area than the one chosen by the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission. A great deal of testimony was given to the committee as to the advisability of locating a much larger sewage treatment plant at the Mattowoman Creek site, and in an area already industrialized. This would be a plant more in keeping with the future needs of the area, would be a joint venture between Prince Georges and Charles Counties, in the State of Maryland, and a design and type much recommended by the Federal Anti-Pollution Control Act. Additional testimony was given that existing facilities could indeed handle the existing sewage treatment problem. No opposition witnesses appeared before the subcommittee. As a result, the proponents of the sewage plant could not be questioned. Yet despite their failure to appear, those urging the construction of such a plant continued to urge the need for speeding up this construction.

None of the supporters of the measure to protect Mount Vernon desired precipitous action. None desired to work serious hardship on the local residents. All were somewhat baffled at the insistence of the great urgency to construct this sewage treatment plant. On further investigation, it was revealed that the developers of a subdivision across the Piscataway Bay, and some distance from the area in question, had plans to create a high-density development. In order to achieve this objective, proper sewage disposal was necessary. They applied for a permit to erect a sewage treatment plant on their own area of development. They then proceeded to abandon the plans for such a plant, and indicated plans to build a marina in the area that was to have served them for proper sewage disposal. At this point, they then urged the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission to construct a sewage plant at Mockley Point, which had the effect of taking the sewage from a high-density development and dumping it onto an area of low-density development. With this knowledge and information, the committee acted to authorize the Federal Government to acquire these areas. The measure was drafted in order to avail the Federal Government of the generosity of the private foundations who offered to give their land to the Federal Government for the purposes of preservation. Our own colleague, the distinguished Congresswoman from Ohio, Mrs. FRANCES BOLTON, who is also the vice regent of the Mount Vernon Ladies Association provided from her private resources, funds to enable the Accokeek Foundation to acquire considerable acreage in order to prevent commercialization. These foundations now stood ready to

donate almost 50 percent of the entire land that would be acquired under Public Law 87-362. The House, upon hearing the able presentation of the chairman of the National Parks Subcommittee, Mr. RUTHERFORD, acted without a dissenting vote to authorize this legislation.

The Senate was no less mindful of this threat to Mount Vernon, and under the capable leadership of the distinguished chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, Mr. ANDERSON, who was joined in this effort by the distinguished Senator from Nevada, chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Lands, Mr. BIBLE, introduced legislation to provide for the Federal protection of Mount Vernon. Since a number of inquiries had not been answered by those seeking to erect a sewage treatment plant, Senator ANDERSON wrote the chairman of the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission, Mr. Blair Smith, indicating that the first session of the 87th Congress was about to end, and that the Senate might better appraise the situation if it were allowed the time to do so. Senator ANDERSON then asked if any plans for construction could be held in abeyance until the Senate returned, thus affording a more ample opportunity to investigate the matter. The chairman of the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission replied that they would be happy to have the advice of the Senate, but made no commitment as to holding plans in abeyance until the Senate returned. As a result of this correspondence, hearings were scheduled quickly before the Subcommittee on Public Lands, under the able chairmanship of Senator BIBLE. Witnesses opposing the measure were members of the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission, the real estate developers and two landowners. The overwhelming majority of witnesses, however, were in strong support of the Anderson bill. The indecisive actions of the opposing witnesses appeared no match for the volume of evidence in support of the measure, and this no doubt hastened the committee, and subsequent Senate action, as the measure passed without dissent. Few measures have come before the Congress with such wide and vigorous support, and it appears that the Congress, in its swift resolve of the matter, has worked the will of the people. I should like to include, Mr. Speaker, at the conclusion of my remarks, a partial list of the many organizations that have supported this legislation.

Beginning with the hearings in the Senate, the tact of the real estate developers and the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission underwent a subtle change. They renounced their earlier position of placing a sewage treatment plant at Mockley Point and assured the Senate that the area could accommodate a park and a sewage treatment plant. There were further assurances that such a plant would not be seen from Mount Vernon, or intrude in any way upon the scenic area, or be disadvantageous to the proposed park itself. This, of course, would have required a reduction in the proposed park area. Later arguments of this same group indicate not only would the plant not be visible, but it would be

appropriately landscaped and blended with the area surrounding it. Evidence to this fact, they contend, is the sewage treatment plant contiguous to the Washington-Baltimore Parkway, which is so well concealed that few people know of its existence.

The proponents of the legislation to protect Mount Vernon have sought to decide these issues on the merits of the relative cases. It should be stated candidly, however, that the proponents of the sewage treatment plant are either incompetent, or they are not coming clean in their discussion of these issues. They use the analogy of the sewage treatment plant near the Baltimore Parkway. Is it their contention that their proposed sewage treatment plant on the Piscataway Bay shore of Maryland is to be of the same size, using essentially the same techniques of sewage disposal? Why do they continue to be vague as to the new location of the sewage treatment plant? Precisely where is it to be? Are we to take their word that while they will need part of the park area, it still will not be seen from Mount Vernon? Mr. Speaker, these arguments are spurious and fall by their own weight. If the plant is to be so small, why do not the developers put it on their own land? But then can it be so small, if the main reason for locating it in the Piscataway area is to serve a large area? As to the exact location, the framers of the legislation were completely aware of possible alternatives and drew the boundaries for Federal acquisition and protection of Mount Vernon with precisely this in mind. The argument that a little sewage treatment plant tucked in the corner of the proposed park would not be intrusive will not wash.

That the developers are anxious to place their sewage in this low density area, or into the park, is without question. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, to include in the Record, at the conclusion of my remarks, a letter from the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission to Mr. Douglas L. Hatch, president of the Prince Georges Utilities Co., an organization controlled by one of the real estate developers, confirming that these real estate developers, through the Prince Georges Utilities Co., had offered a contribution of \$500,000 to the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission, if they would build this plant in the Piscataway Bay area. Perhaps it is good business for the developers to enhance the value of their own property by paying to have their sewage dumped on someone else, but it is a serious question as to whether it is good business for the American people. Mr. Speaker, I suggest that it takes quite a degree of callousness to infer that the legislation authorizing Federal acquisition is too greedy, and too asking in terms of the need it seeks to meet, when the people making these charges are the same ones who would have public agencies bail them out of their own financial dilemma at a considerable cost to the American public in terms of a most serious intrusion upon one of the most majestic, most historic, most revered scenes of the Nation.

The concern of this country has been manifest again and again at the disappearance of open space—the encroachments upon national shrines and monuments, and the need for concerted action to preserve and protect these benefices of nature that are irreplaceable. This is not a matter of partisan politics, but rather of deep national concern that touches all regardless of political persuasion. Those who have been active in the effort to further protect Mount Vernon represent every walk of life. The leadership in this great body to which I referred to earlier has been forthright and basic, and practiced by Chairman ASPINALL and the members of his committee. The same statement can be made of the distinguished chairman, Mr. ANDERSON, who has a like role in the Senate. The backgrounds of these men indicate the knowledgeability and wisdom that they consistently bring to these matters.

Certainly, the Mount Vernon Ladies' Association is to be congratulated for their long-time efforts in the early restoration and preservation of Mount Vernon, inclusive of all its grounds and buildings. The State of Virginia has aided and abetted the Mount Vernon Ladies' Association over the years in order to present to the American people and the world, the home of America's first President in a proper and reverent setting, and their efforts should be honored and appreciated.

Aid and invaluable assistance in this vigilance was received by the Citizens Committee on Natural Resources, under the leadership of Dr. Ira N. Gabrielson, often referred to by his colleagues and Government leaders alike as "Mr. Conservation." Their concern for the dignity and preservation of monuments so cherished by this country has been long evidenced by the activities of this fine group and their judgments respected.

Of great significance, has been the appreciation and gracious demeanor of our first family for the shrine of Mount Vernon, perhaps evidenced by Mrs. Kennedy's description as the "Nation's most revered house." This is a charge to all Americans to keep it that way.

WASHINGTON SUBURBAN  
SANITARY COMMISSION.

MR. DOUGLAS L. HATCH,  
President, Prince George's Utilities, Inc.,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HATCH: Please refer to the commission's letter of August 26, 1960, wherein you were advised that the commission had approved the project consisting of a sewage treatment plant and the necessary sewers and pumping stations to serve the Piscataway drainage basin, subject to a contribution of \$500,000. As you know, since that time considerable opposition has been voiced toward the construction of a sewage treatment plant in the Piscataway Bay area, both by letters and in person at the hearing held by the commission on January 13, 1961, at the courthouse at Upper Marlboro regarding this project.

At the hearing the commission was strongly urged to undertake a joint project with Charles County and construct a sewage treatment plant in the vicinity of Mattawoman Creek. Preliminary investigations have been made and the matter discussed with the officials of Charles County and the indications are that Charles County would not be in a

position to proceed promptly with such a project. Before making any final decision on the location of a sewage treatment plant, however, the commission would like the engineering department to complete its study regarding this possibility and pursue the matter further with officials of Charles County.

One of the major objections to the construction of a sewerage system in the Piscataway drainage basin at this time is that a large part of the area is outside of the regional district of the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission and not subject to zoning controls. The Park and Planning Commission has included in its proposed legislation that this area be added to the regional district at this session of the General Assembly of the State of Maryland. If such legislation is passed it would normally be effective June 1, 1961.

At the hearing the commission presented a letter from Mrs. Wolman and Geyer, consultants to the Washington Metropolitan Regional Sanitary Board, indicating that the construction of a plant on Piscataway Bay would not be inconsistent with the regional sewerage system for the metropolitan area. The commission has been advised that the final report being prepared by those consultants is expected to be completed in June. The commission desires, if possible, that its sewerage program be consistent with the regional sewer plan for the metropolitan area.

In view of the above, the commission has decided that it is not in a position to proceed at this time with the proposed project for Piscataway Bay which it indicated it would undertake subject to a contribution of \$500,000. Before definitely deciding to proceed with this project, the commission desires to have available to it the results of further discussion with Charles County, the decision as to whether the area is added to the regional district and the report of the Washington Metropolitan Regional Sanitary Board. It appears that all of this information should be available by July of this year, at which time a decision can be made as to the method of handling the sewage of the Piscataway basin. The commission realizes that this will delay your program, but it is believed to be in the best public interest to follow such a procedure.

Very truly yours,  
JOHN BONIFANT, Secretary.

## Little People to Little People Program

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ROLAND V. LIBONATI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1962

MR. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, there are many young lads who are anxious to impress the youths of other lands as to the advantages of American life for teenagers. This situation was brought to the fore, recently, in a program initiated by Master Peter Rodino, son of our illustrious colleague from New Jersey, called little people to little people—a letter-writing crusade for peace through the exchange of correspondence between teenagers of other nations and the children of the United States.

Youth, in its natural simplicity of understanding, is basically dedicated to the simple ideologies of American life. The flourish of empty words, descriptive of nothing, are strange to their style of

writing. Youth sees freedom through every experience. Youth has a sense of ascertaining the real truths of existence.

In most instances where youth has failed to meet the challenges of life, lack of straight adult thinking has been the cause of youth's failures.

We congratulate young Peter Rodino and, of course, he has made his dad very proud. The old adage seems to be the proof in this case, "Like sire, like son."

### A Tribute to William Holsinger

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1962

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, it is with a real feeling of privilege that I speak today on behalf of the Ohio Republican delegation of the 87th Congress, to pay tribute to one of the unusually consecrated and loyal citizens of our free America, Col. H. William Holsinger. I am particularly happy to do this today because February 22 is the birthday of Bill Holsinger. Meeting together, the Republican men of Ohio asked me to speak for them, as I do for myself in extending birthday greetings and saying "thanks for a job well done."

On December 20, 1961, H. William Holsinger retired as manager of the Cleveland, Ohio, Regional Office of the Veterans' Administration. Col. Bill Holsinger has "stacked arms" and is now beginning to enjoy the luxury of a life without schedules or deadlines. His stern Pennsylvania-Dutch heritage would not consider such a lighthearted way of life until all parts were neatly cleaned up and stored away in their proper niche. Now that is done—and with the same zeal he applied to his life of service—he is embarking on his leisure years.

William Holsinger, born on February 22, 1900, is a lineal descendant of a family with their roots deep in the soil of America. Early immigrants to William Penn's colony along the eastern seaboard and then service in the Colonial Army during the Revolutionary War is typical of the heritage bestowed on him by his forebears. Each conflict found a member of the Holsinger family enrolled in the ranks and several battlefield crosses exemplify their ultimate sacrifice. Late in World War I, young Bill Holsinger, true to his lineage, volunteered for service. An early cessation of hostilities terminated his active service in that conflict but it did not quench the inner fire of service to his country.

In the early twenties, after moving to Ohio, he joined the Ohio National Guard and shortly after became the bugler for Gen. (then colonel) Ludwig Connolly of the 145th Infantry.

This recognition of his musical ability was no coincidence. The innate love of the silver-tipped notes of the cornet had appealed to Bill very early—and with

his usual perseverance he became the master of this musical instrument at an early age. To this day—hundreds of miles are but minutes away if there is a military band concert to be heard upon arrival. If he is more attentive to the trumpet section—and nods approvingly after the spirited passages of Sousa's "Stars and Stripes Forever"—it is truly the accolade of one of the finest—for Bill did play cornet under the "March King," John Philip Sousa.

A graduate of the University of Akron in 1924 and Cleveland Law School in 1927, Bill Holsinger taught and coached athletes for several years before entering the practice of law.

In the early thirties he became one of the young trial attorneys in the U.S. District Attorney's Office for Northern District of Ohio. Following this he went to other positions of trust in public service, in the city of Cleveland, and the State of Ohio. During these important early years of his career he still gave unstintingly of himself to community and charity work.

Following Pearl Harbor, Lt. William Holsinger, Infantry, ORC, again volunteered to serve his country in an emergency. He was called to active duty and immediately put in counter-espionage duty in the highly industrialized Ohio River Valley. His ability was soon recognized and when the Army organized their first CIC School in Chicago in 1942, Lieutenant Holsinger was on the faculty and soon became the Assistant Commandant of that school.

While a good soldier and willing to perform his assignment, Bill wanted to get to a combat zone. Soon he was en route to the Philippines with the 80th (Wildcat) Infantry Division where he shortly entered into combat. His early training as a young Infantry officer was soon to exact its toll when the repeated firings of the heavy 80-mm. mortar in combat began to affect his hearing. Shortly thereafter he joined the 11th Airborne Division for its occupation duty in northern Japan but this was not to last long.

With the Allied decision to prosecute those guilty of war crimes, Major Holsinger was summoned for duty as executive officer of the Judge Advocate's Section of Gen. Douglas MacArthur's Supreme Allied Command Headquarters in the Far East. Because of his earlier training in the U.S. district attorney's office, and his capacity for thoroughly building his cases, he established an enviable reputation in this position and upon his departure was awarded the Army Commendation Medal.

With World War II and the war crimes trials behind him, Bill decided that he and his lovely wife Maude, whom he married on August 30, 1930, would travel a bit before he resumed his practice of law. His intentions were of the best but his ancestry was not to be denied. Soon he was deeply engrossed in his practice and a greater demand for his services in the community caused the cancellation of these well-laid travel and vacation plans. A short trip to Europe was realized but a return to Japan had to be deferred.

On October 4, 1954, William Holsinger was sworn in as the third manager in the history of the Veterans' Administration regional office at Cleveland, Ohio. He then became responsible for the veterans benefits program for over 750,000 veterans of northern Ohio.

That he was acutely aware of the magnitude of this task was evident 2 days later when he appeared before the Disabled American Veterans and pledged himself to serve the veterans and their families of his area 24 hours a day and 365 days a year if necessary to get the job done. He declared an "open door" policy for his office and invited public inspection of any and all parts of the regional office.

Every veterans' organization and their auxiliaries in Ohio soon had the opportunity of hearing this pledge of service repeated at their meetings. Incredulous at first, everyone soon found this dedicated individual meant exactly what he said from their platforms. He was in his office to hear their stories; he took their telephone calls even late at night; he responded to their letters and he appeared at their meetings. He personally set an example of service that very soon infiltrated every work level of the VA regional office.

His vigorous support of the national service officers stationed in the Cleveland regional office brought about a high degree of cooperation with these skilled representatives that made this relationship extremely unusual in VA history. Testimonials of the high regard and esteem which Bill Holsinger engendered from these worthy critics of veteran service were the plaques and honors from every service organization represented in the area of the Cleveland regional office. These were the tributes accorded the man in their midst whom they had adjudged as serving them best.

During Bill Holsinger's tenure as manager of the Cleveland regional office he met with the many changes required of his office, additional responsibilities, revised procedures, mechanization, and, finally, conversion to the automatic data-processing system being introduced into the Veterans' Administration.

As one of the pioneer automatic data processing stations, Cleveland met the problem, met the deadlines and brought distinction to the northern Ohio regional office by mastering this tremendous conversion without one single word of criticism from service organizations, press or radio. Areas of possible trouble had been anticipated and a way to correct the trouble had been devised. A delayed widow's check received important attention, and if the delay were unusual, Bill Holsinger's name was on the request to get financial relief to that widow at once. His personal interest in service to our veterans included mid-winter inspections of GI home construction; his visits to the campus of Ohio schools and colleges and to night schools; his inspections of the Ohio Soldiers and Sailors Home; his many conferences with probate judges; his attendance at service officer schools, and many other unsung personal efforts which attest to the true dedication of

Bill Holsinger in his leadership of the Cleveland regional office from October 4, 1954, to December 20, 1961.

Now, this kind and understanding citizen, this civilian-soldier, this dedicated American has stacked his weapon, laid aside his pen and with his lifelong helpmate at his side is going to travel and rest, revisit old scenes and renew old acquaintances. It is a well earned and certainly a deserved respite from his busy life of service to his country and his fellow man.

Many of our veterans carry their chins a little higher; many of their families are better cared for; many are better housed and are more responsible citizens because of his personal interest, his unwavering devotion and abiding loyalty to his credo of "Service to those who served."

So to Col. William Holsinger as he enters into his retirement we say: May all your sunsets be glowing red to set you merrily on your way and all of your tomorrows be filled with the joys and pleasures of life which you so diligently earned and so richly deserve. Godspeed and good health.

## Which Road for Transportation: Private Management or —?—Part No. V

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1962

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to be one of nine men interviewed by Traffic World magazine in a series dealing with our views on the future course of our troubled transportation system. As reprinted by Traffic World in booklet form, my comments are as follows:

#### INTERVIEW V

(JAMES VAN ZANDT is the Republican Member of Congress for the 20th District of Pennsylvania. He was elected to Congress in November 1938. Since then, except for a period of 3½ years with the Armed Forces in World War II, he has served continuously as a Member of the House of Representatives. Mr. VAN ZANDT has always shown a quick interest in transportation, perhaps because he began a railroad career in 1916 as a molder apprentice in the Pennsylvania Railroad's shops at Altoona. He was district passenger agent for the road when he was granted a furlough to seek a career in public office.)

In the last 20 years there have been bills introduced in Congress which, to one degree or another, would give to the President of the United States authority over the independent agencies created by Congress. What is the explanation for this tendency on the part of Members of Congress to "make over" their authority to the Executive?

I have observed no tendency in Congress as a whole to "make over" to the President the authority which Congress exercises over the independent agencies. While it is true that bills to this effect have been introduced, and may be again, it is, of course, one thing to introduce a bill and quite another to get it enacted into law. The Congress will not

lightly renounce its authority or shirk responsibility in this field.

There has been some experience, as of now, with independent agencies for which the chairmen have been appointed by the President. Is there any evidence that such appointments have actually made any difference in agency procedures or lessened the criticism of delay or inefficiency?

If there is any evidence that independent agencies with chairmen appointed by the President have fared better than those without, I have yet to learn of it. On the contrary, the Interstate Commerce Commission, which does not have a politically appointed Chairman, is the oldest and probably the most respected of all the independent agencies. Each of these agencies, it should be remembered, is responsible for a vital segment of the Nation's economy. The individuals selected to staff them must have not only the highest possible qualifications but must also be free to exercise their best judgment without fear of political repercussion. I cannot foresee any public benefit in making a political football of the agencies responsible for the regulation of public utilities—transportation, communications, power, etc.

Coming to the present: A bill in the Senate would give the President power to remove a member of an independent agency who was "frustrating" the President's program. Would not passage of such a bill represent an abandonment by Congress of a vital part of its power to create such agencies and to set the policies they must follow?

Emphatically, yes. I recall that one President tried to infringe upon the rights of the judicial branch by attempting to pack the Supreme Court, but Congress blocked it. We must be constantly on the alert to prevent Executive power from intruding further into the legislative and judicial branches.

Should the Reorganization Act be amended so that it would be clear that reorganization plans submitted to Congress by the President must deal only with agencies in the executive branch or with executive duties which Congress has seen fit to place in the independent agencies?

Under the Reorganization Act the executive branch and other interested parties are encouraged to express their views on the independent agencies. But I believe the responsibility for modifying these agencies must remain the responsibility of Congress. At the same time, I feel that Congress should consider promptly any agency reorganization proposal which comes from the agency itself. No one is more familiar with an agency's problems than the agency.

Is there any validity in the suggestion that the antitrust laws could be substituted in the field of transportation for the present regulatory scheme?

The field of transportation presents a unique regulatory problem in the business world. For instance in transportation an exception is necessary to the usual application of the antitrust laws in order to provide a stable rate structure upon which shippers can depend in determining transportation costs. Congress, in recognizing the unique problems presented by regulation of transportation, established the ICC to act in the public interest in this regard.

But there are things we can do right now to help solve the transportation problem. We can relax the archaic and unnecessary regulations, most of which were written 75 years or so ago, so that they are brought into line with our modern economy. To me, the key word in your question here is "scheme." That's exactly what we have now—a transportation scheme instead of a transportation plan or system. We have a hodgepodge of conflicting rules and regulations which work tremendous hardship on such parts of the transportation industry as the railroads, which need all the help they can get now—not all the hindrance.

Assuming that the present basic regulatory scheme is to be continued, can it be rolled back in any way to give a larger area for the exercise of managerial discretion and still protect the public interest?

Yes, certainly the public can be protected while giving management a greater voice in running its own business. The railroads are a classic example of this. They are regulated today as if they were a monopoly when in fact they are fighting for their lives in one of the most competitive of all businesses. For example, railroads are sometimes denied the right to pass along to shippers, in the form of reduced rates, the benefits of their inherent low-cost advantage, all the while competing with carriers subject to no rate regulation at all. And instead of correcting this obviously inequitable situation, we saw a Senate committee this year hold hearings on S. 1197, a bill to further seriously restrict the railroads' ability to lower rates.

Should some thought be given, now, to adjusting the competitive situation as between the railroads and the water carriers, air carriers, and motor carriers which use federally supported facilities and, for the future, as between the air carriers and the motor carriers of property?

I certainly believe that such adjustments should be made, and I favor the user charge principle as a means of achieving such adjustments. As you may know I introduced in the House this year a bill providing for the establishment of user charges on inland waterways to help cover Federal expenditures on those waterways.

Every President back to and including Hoover has supported the user charge principle. Last winter President Kennedy instructed his Budget Director to formulate general principles for the application of user charges for all types of Federal projects. Numerous study groups have recommended charges for the users of airways, waterways, and highways—charges in which the user pays his fair share. This matter of user charges—or rather the lack of them—works especially hard against the railroads which must acquire, maintain and pay taxes on their rights-of-way while their competitors benefit tremendously from publicly built or operated rights-of-way on which they pay no property taxes and usually inadequate user charges. This of course places the railroads in an almost hopeless competitive position.

From the standpoint of service to the entire public, the common carrier represents the mode which has emerged under the free enterprise system, and many in important positions have said that, if free enterprise in the field of transportation is lost, it will be lost in other areas of the economy. What steps, in principle, could be taken to preserve free enterprise in transportation?

I believe the key factor in preserving the free enterprise system in the transportation industry is simply the will to do so. We know the way to do it, as borne out in seven studies of the transportation industry since World War II—modernize the rules and regulations which govern the industry, stamp out the inequities, establish a transportation system instead of a transportation jumble. But do we have the will to permit free enterprise work in this case? Sometimes I wonder.

A number of bills have been offered which would permit single ownership of multiple modes of transportation as a means of coordinating the various modes. Is the view that the only true coordination would come from common ownership of end-to-end modes a valid one?

As I see it, the various modes of transportation are simply tools which should be used by transportation companies or systems in carrying out as efficiently as possible their jobs of providing the best and cheapest transportation service. A transportation

company should no more be denied the use of any of these tools than a carpenter should be denied the use of his hammer or his saw in building a house. In a recent speech, A. G. Anderson, general traffic manager of the Socony Mobil Oil Co., said it was wishful thinking to believe that coordination of transportation media can be secured by voluntary cooperation. "No carrier will voluntarily give to another mode a movement that it can haul itself," he said. "Only integrated transportation companies can furnish complete service to shippers. If such integration were to be given legislative sanction, the shipper would be able to purchase from one carrier that combination of transportation facilities best suited to his needs."

Does the piggyback system, with independent motor carriers delivering the container at one end of the rail, water, or air haul, and the same or another independent motor carrier making the delivery at the completion of the rail, water, or air haul, hold the germ for future sound development of competing systems of transportation?

In transportation, as in science and technology in general, great strides are being made in improved techniques. No roadblocks should be placed in the way of putting these improvements into practice. Piggybacking is but one of many innovations in transportation, and it is important because it is a means of combining more than one form of transportation. But it is under no circumstances to be considered an alternative to providing transportation by any and all means and in any combination under competing transportation systems.

Besides piggybacking, major steps forward in the transport of freight by rail include the trilevel racks for hauling new automobiles on freight cars; hauling grain at reduced rates, in multiple-car lots, by employing new high capacity cars, and the fivefold expansion since World War II of centralized traffic control (CTC) which increases the capacity of a single-track line by 75 to 80 percent. Also entire freight trains can be reassembled now in just a few minutes in electronic freight yards.

But too often roadblocks are placed in the way of passing the benefits of these improvements on to the shipper and the public. For instance, the Tennessee Valley Authority has protested the proposed reduction of rail rates on grain and related commodities between the Ohio River and points in the Southeast. The lower rates were proposed as a result of lower costs, made possible by larger cars moving in multiple-car lots, to meet the competition of water carriers. TVA protested the rates because it said it had spent more than \$200 million in Federal funds to make the Tennessee River navigable to haul grain by water from the Midwest to the Southeast, and that the proposed rail rates were designed to eliminate the barge movement of grain. I think this is a shocking situation, when a branch of the Federal Government opposes passing on to the public the benefit of lowered rail costs.

## You Fear the Least What You Know the Most About

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1962

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, millions upon millions of Americans and friends of this country are rejoicing in the superb achievement of an American test pilot.

The mass media have been describing to us both the fantastic details of Colonel Glenn's 81,000-mile trip and the tremendous wave of worldwide approbation which has followed that flight. We rejoice in his safety and have united to honor the steadfast courage and skill which enabled him to achieve for us and for the free world this signal advance.

We would find it difficult to express our pride in John Glenn and the NASA, however, without observing that it is due as well to the thousands of other skilled hands and minds which made the flight possible. For example, approximately 15,000 scientists, technicians, engineers, administrators, and factory workers labored for as much as 4 years in the development and manufacture of the Mercury space capsule alone in a program directed by the McDonnell Aircraft Corp., and involving 4,000 subcontractors and suppliers throughout the country. Without the educated brainpower which this program represents, Tuesday's achievement could never have been. Nor would it have been attempted without such other necessary systems as the complex global tracking network created by the NASA through the Western Electric Co. and four other private corporations with help from the Lincoln Laboratory of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

In short, then, what Colonel Glenn's flight represents is a mutual effort of the several branches of American life in a pooling of scientific know-how. It is beyond question a tribute of the highest order to American educational achievement.

It is not a final tribute, however; more remains to be done. We remember that the Soviets have launched and recovered a manned spacecraft weighing more than twice as much as the *Friendship 7*, remaining in orbit for a considerably greater length of time, and effecting a return on land. As President Kennedy observed on Tuesday, we have a long way to go in this space race. We started late.

In this and in so many areas, however, we shall move forward confidently, at a rate largely dependent upon the earnestness with which we support and further American education.

Important decisions determining our support of that education will rest with this body. I am deeply hopeful that we shall not evade our most serious responsibilities. In a letter from a hero whose birthday we celebrate today, the first President of this Nation, we find a timely reminder:

If there cannot be money found to answer the common purposes of education it is evident that there is something amiss in the ruling political power.

If there is another hero of the day—and there is indeed—it is Col. John Glenn. It seems appropriate in several ways to quote him too. This recent observation, offered in the context of his courageous undertaking, is no less profound a comment on the goals of American education: "You fear the least what you know the most about."

There is much to know in this day of scientific revolution; and sometimes we

may think that there is much to fear. On Tuesday millions of Americans stopped work to listen to news of the magnificent flight. Among them were millions of schoolchildren, into whose classrooms the radio coverage was broadcast. To them especially was this triumph of enormous significance. It is in those classrooms and the classrooms to come that such children will be offered—or not offered—worthy introduction to the mysteries of the many broadening fields of knowledge, including space science, into which they will be called. It is there that such education, if we offer it, will afford them the thorough knowledge that dispels fear and makes possible the kind of magnificent and courageous achievements which we have seen exemplified this week.

Colonel Glenn has moved us forward at the same time that he has called us back to ourselves, reminding us of what can be accomplished through the American brand of education. I join my colleagues and countless others in offering him and his fellow discoverers my sincere admiration and gratitude.

## The Case Against U.S. Trading With Communist Bloc Countries—Speech by Hon. Thomas M. Pelly, of Washington

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

## HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1962

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit for inclusion in the RECORD a speech by Representative THOMAS M. PELLY, which he delivered before the Yale University Political Union on February 19, 1962.

The speech was on a most timely topic entitled "The Case Against U.S. Trading With Communist Bloc Countries."

As a member of the House Select Committee on Export Control which over a number of months has been holding hearings and conducting studies in regard to trade with the Soviet bloc and U.S. trade control policies, I believe it is vital that the nature of the problems confronting us in this area are known by the citizens of the Nation.

It is important in my opinion for the citizens to know the significance of trade with the bloc which helps toward building up Soviet economic and military capabilities.

I was therefore happy to see that this subject was discussed by Representative PELLY on that occasion.

### THE CASE AGAINST U.S. TRADING WITH COMMUNIST BLOC COUNTRIES

(Text of speech of Representative THOMAS M. PELLY, First District, Washington State, delivered before Yale University Political Union, Monday, February 19, 1962)

Friends and members of the Yale Political Union, as a preface to our discussion on the subject of trade with Communist bloc nations, it would seem to be orderly procedure to start with a summary of U.S. policies under which our trade is conducted.

Difficult as it is to do it, the U.S. policy attempts to draw a distinction between strategic and nonstrategic goods and materials.

Yet one may fairly wonder if there are any such items as "nonstrategic" goods as far as Soviet needs are concerned. The war of two ideologies is being waged on two fronts: On the one hand it is a contest of armaments, missiles, and military strength and on the other it is one of economic competition in which the Communist leaders, I would suppose, expect to outdo us. On this latter score, it is difficult to identify products that lack significant strategic value.

Tonight I have thought to comment in a general way on sales to the Communists of commercial goods and then after that to discuss trade which more directly bears on our national security.

The policy of the United States under the Export Control Act of 1949 is to use export controls to the extent necessary (a) to protect the domestic economy from a drain on strategic materials (and with a huge oversupply of stockpiled materials at the present time, this provision can be ignored this evening) and (b) the policy is to use export controls to further the foreign policy of the United States, and (c) also the policy is to exercise the necessary vigilance over exports from the standpoint of national security.

Under the law, our policies of security export controls include embargoes to Communist China, North Korea, North Vietnam, and, as of 10 days ago, Cuba (embargoes to those four areas); and restrictive controls of exports to the U.S.S.R. and other Soviet bloc countries, limiting direct shipments of U.S. products for these latter destinations to nonstrategic exports. Controls over our shipments to the free world countries cover only a highly selected list of goods to prevent, if possible, their unauthorized diversion to the Soviet bloc.

All commercial exports from the United States, its territories, and possessions are prohibited unless the Department of Commerce has either issued a validated license or established a general license permitting such shipments.

It should be noted, perhaps, that following congressional adjournment last fall, the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee had under study the operations and effectiveness of our export controls on shipments of strategic goods to the Sino-Soviet bloc; and more recently, a select committee of the House of Representatives has concluded hearings in connection with a study of the administration, operation, and enforcement of the Export Control Act. This act expires June 30, 1962, and its reenactment will come up for consideration shortly, so our discussion tonight is timely.

These House and Senate studies were the result of public concern as to the Government's wisdom in allowing shipments of certain commodities, machines, and manufactured products to the Sino-Soviet bloc.

Also, as much as anything, a sale of \$365 million worth of grain by Canada to Red China and public disclosure of various transactions such as U.S. sale of jet planes to Yugoslavia were the cause of indignant protests by the American people over existing policies. Certain Members of Congress have criticized the administration and in my case I introduced legislation to ban all exports to all nations with Communist governments. Indeed, I have wanted to go further and restrict economic assistance of any kind to nations which sell so-called semistrategic materials such as grain to the Communists.

Here I must point up that the distinction between strategic and nonstrategic materials has posed a difficult problem and raised a strong difference of views in our Govern-

ment. In administering the Export Act, the Secretary of Commerce consults with the Departments of State and Defense and other agencies of Government. Of course, the decision for or against trade with the Communists ultimately will be decided by the people. The force of overall public opinion, under our system of Government, eventually sets policy. Momentarily, however, the distress of many Members of Congress, it appears that the administration's desire to increase industrial output and to increase foreign trade, even with the Soviet bloc, has resulted in the lifting of restrictions on strategic commodities; either this, or we seem to have gone along submissively with our allies.

Data as to the nature and amount of trade with the Soviet bloc is very limited. This is because (1) the Communists do not publish complete and continuous information concerning their economic activities, and (2) all prices within the Soviet bloc are administered prices with frequent changes. For example, in East Germany the price of an automobile is approximately 16,000 marks, whereas the identical car can be bought in West Germany for about 7,000 marks.

Another case I have seen cited is of a tractor selling for the equivalent of 21,500 Swiss francs inside the bloc, as against 13,600 Swiss francs outside the bloc, and other similar examples have been quoted in wheat and coal sales.

Exports from the Soviet bloc are based on political considerations, while as for Soviet purchases Khrushchev has been quoted as saying: "We want to buy products in which we really are interested." He has made it clear that the Soviets do not intend to open themselves as a market for goods just because the free world is seeking a consumer outlet for its surplus production.

One of the arguments against U.S. trade with the Soviet bloc is the business risk involved which is greater than in trading with other areas. Bloc trade involves another difficulty, in the lack of commercial skills on the part of the Communists and always the dangers of unilateral breach of contract by Soviet bloc countries hangs like the sword of Damocles over East-West business transactions. Invariably, claims for damages due to breach of contract have been decided by a panel of Soviet arbitrators in Russia's favor and legal redress through Communist courts is of doubtful value.

Especially the United States stands to lose in East-West trade because of the abuse of any patent protection. The Communists have become masters of product copying, bypassing time-consuming research and development expense; and also thereby eliminating the need for further trade. There is no effective protection against patent piracy by the Soviets because there are no patent conventions.

Some American economists take the position that with the exception of munitions and arms, our official policy should be one of free trade between the Communists and non-Communists. Support for this position may be prejudiced, owing to the fact that trade with Communist countries is often quite profitable to free world traders. Price is arbitrary in the bloc countries, which often brings lucrative short-term benefits.

On the other hand many, including myself, take the position that the Soviet bloc would not purchase anything from us unless it was to their economic and political advantage to do so.

In short, without any military considerations, a good case can be made against trading with the Soviet bloc countries as far as U.S. national interests are concerned, especially since our trade with the Communists is insignificant in the aggregate and I believe that in the balance the United States is better off without it. So much for commercial trade.

Now, let us consider the sale of so-called strategic goods—items of military significance.

The Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951—known as the Battle Act—supplements the Export Control Act. The Battle Act declares it to be the policy of the United States to embargo shipments of arms, ammunition and implements of war, atomic energy materials, petroleum, transportation and other materials of strategic value to nations threatening U.S. security, including the U.S.S.R. and nations under its domination.

This act, moreover, makes it mandatory to stop any kind of assistance to any nation which knowingly allows sale of arms to the Soviet bloc. Sale of strategic materials used in war production to Communist bloc countries calls for termination of U.S. aid, unless the President decides cessation of aid would be detrimental to our security.

Unfortunately, in my opinion, the provision calling for discontinuance of aid to a nation selling materials of strategic value to Soviet bloc countries has not been used. There is not one case of the Battle Act provision having been invoked. On the other hand, there have been 19 Presidential determinations to continue U.S. assistance in spite of other nations having sold strategic materials to the Soviet bloc. These were the following countries: Belgium, Denmark, West Germany, France, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands, Norway, Turkey, and the United Kingdom. Fourteen determinations affecting eight countries have been classified under Executive privilege so there is no information available on these latter cases.

As to the free world system of controls, the United States consults with 14 other free world countries, Belgium, France, Norway, Denmark, United Kingdom, Netherlands, Luxembourg, West Germany, Portugal, Italy, France, Turkey, Japan, and Canada—a voluntary association of representatives of these nations known as Cocom (for Coordinating Committee) has been formed.

Cocom countries have one list of commodities under complete embargo on export to the Soviet bloc. This group of nations has as its basic purpose the denial to the Communists of materials, equipment and technical data involving technical services which would aid the military-industrial mobilization base of unfriendly countries. Or at least that was its objective at the start.

Over the years since 1950 when Cocom was organized, through its members' eagerness to increase their foreign trade, many items on the international list of embargoed commodities have been removed, even though of obvious strategic importance.

In addition to the Cocom list, in the United States the Department of Commerce has a list known as the positive list. These are called presumption-for-denial items against export to the Communists. Validated licenses must be obtained for export of these commodities to all destinations except Canada.

The chairman of the House Committee on Export Policy, Congressman PAUL KIRCHIN, of South Carolina—a former FBI agent—stated the other day that evidence establishes that the Cocom list, the Battle Act list, and the positive list have all been eroded, meaning that bit by bit their effectiveness has been lessened by deletions and yet it takes unanimous decision of all member nations to remove an item from the Cocom list. The excuse is that willingness on our part for the removal of items from the list was to prevent a breakdown in the whole setup, but I am far from sure those administering our controls themselves genuinely believed in the control program. U.S. decisions, we are told, in allowing licenses to be issued on export commodities of strategic goods to the Soviet bloc follow a policy of granting permission

on the basis that if some other country will supply an item we will approve it, too. As an example, the Department of Defense strenuously objected to approval of an application for the issuance of a license to export to the U.S.S.R. certain machines capable of producing 360,000 V-8 engine motor blocks each year.

Due to diplomatic considerations, a request was requested. Secretary of Defense McNamara reversed the position of all the Department experts. The reason given was that similar machines could be obtained from alternative sources abroad. These machines had been internationally embargoed by the 14 Cocom countries—but for reasons unknown had been deleted from the list.

The application, however, is still pending because the Congress is interested. Someone is fearful of public reaction to this sale which would increase greatly the Soviet production of military trucks and tanks.

At the present time, also, in the Department of Commerce there are pending export applications for many millions of dollars worth of similar commodities, classified as strategic, to the Soviet bloc countries. Since Congress has been studying export policy, there has been a marked slowdown in such approvals.

However, that does not alter the situation that prior to this study vast quantities of scrap copper, steel, and iron scrap, borates, and hundreds of other strategic commodities were allowed to go to Communist Yugoslavia. Have we so soon forgotten the tragic lessons of history—Bataan, Pearl Harbor, Midway, Guadalcanal, to name only a few—when we were on the receiving end of our own scrap iron from Japan? And, by the way, before World War II, Secretary of State Dean Rusk, a younger man then, and perhaps wiser, picketed the loading of that scrap iron for Japan at San Francisco.

Speaking of Yugoslavia, the United States has had a less restrictive policy on exports to Poland and Yugoslavia than to the Soviet Union.

Our policy has been to encourage the development of free world economic ties with Yugoslavia. For example, under that policy, through various programs we have supplied her Government with 683 planes. We have equipped and maintained her air force. With regard to Poland, we have permitted more liberal export policies so as to evidence our sympathy and support to the Polish people.

Public Law 87-195 of September 4, 1961 (so-called foreign aid), section 620(B) states: "No assistance shall be furnished under this act to the government of any country unless the President determines that such country is not dominated or controlled by the international Communist movement."

My mail tells me many of my constituents disagree with the President's determination in these two instances of Yugoslavia and Poland. I think you will agree and history will support the view of my constituents. You who have studied the Marxian philosophy—now, ask yourselves in all seriousness—on whose side do you think these nations will be in any final showdown?

The United States in recent years has exported billions of dollars worth of food and military aid to Yugoslavia, including jet airplanes, and trained their pilots under the policy that such assistance is in the interest of national defense. Tito's expressed pro-Soviet attitude at the Belgrade Conference of so-called neutrals has caused great indignation and unhappiness among the American people. Yugoslavia's votes in the United Nations—and particularly the one in favor of admitting Red China—added to the public fury. But Secretary of State Rusk takes the position our aid and trade is not designed to win friends. So he testified—I had thought otherwise.

Some of us believe communism is the same in the U.S.S.R., Poland, Yugoslavia, Cuba, or even in this country. The purpose of the Communists in some 80 of the world's countries is revolution and an international conspiracy frankly intent on destroying free governments and, as Khrushchev put it, "to bury us." Poland's position on international issues is rarely distinguished from that of the Soviet bloc. She is formally bound to the U.S.S.R. by treaties and such instrumentalities as the Warsaw Pact and her troops maneuver in East Germany. I cannot understand a policy that says she is not controlled by the international Communist movement. I cannot agree that technical assistance by Yugoslavia and Poland to Cuba, North Korea, and North Vietnam is normal and natural, as viewed by Secretary Rusk.

The President of the United States through the advice of the National Security Council determines export policy within the framework of law. In this connection, it has appeared that after his inauguration, President Kennedy embarked on a course of seeking to win Soviet good will through a change in trade policies.

One such generous impulse was an announcement in March 1961, as I recall, whereby the ban was lifted on shipment to the Soviet bloc of surplus subsidized grain. Here, the idea of allowing Russians to buy food at considerably lower prices than American housewives can buy it resulted in many indignant American consumers. And then there arose the question: Is not food a strategic commodity? Does not an army still march on its stomach? Certainly our military experts believe this is true.

Secretary Rusk argues that because of Soviet difficulties in their agricultural program, the Communists are forced to strain themselves to buy foodstuffs rather than use their foreign exchange for supporting subversion and revolution abroad. The Secretary takes the point of view it is safer for us if they use foreign exchange to acquire food rather than for purchase of other goods. This has logic.

Yet, let us look at the other side of the argument. Agriculture is one of the really serious problems of the Communists, a problem wherein they suffered their most serious failure. Why not keep as many workers as possible in the fields meeting Soviet food needs rather than in factories producing implements of war? Remember, the Soviet Union is capable of feeding its own people, provided it concentrates on production of food instead of building up its military potential.

The issue of selling grain for food is especially important in connection with Red China. Many Americans, of course, are soft-hearted and cannot support a policy of refusing food to people who are hungry. Other people were sharply critical of Canada when it negotiated the \$365 million sale of surplus wheat to Red China. That was when the United States relented and approved of the United States supplying pumps to unload the grain in Red China. In my judgment, this issue is recognition that actually we are at war, cold though it be.

I hold the view that after three bad crop years—and little prospect of being able to feed her exploding population—agriculture under Red China's Communist system has failed miserably. The food shortage is the one way of proving to the skeptical mainland Chinese that their system cannot compete with free enterprise. Signs have appeared in China: "We want food—not machines."

So, when Canada, Australia, and more recently, France, provide food, it seems to me they are helping assure that communism in China will succeed.

Suppose we sold the 500,000 tons of wheat to Russia, an order for which Secretary Hodges, of Commerce, had under consideration—and still does, I believe—there would

be no way to prevent her transshipping it on to Red China for propaganda purposes.

I feel in the long run we could do our free way of life more good by going on paying storage costs, onerous as that is. Anything, rather than help communism succeed. America cannot win a cold war without sacrifice. We cannot do business as usual, practicing the Golden Rule, unless all parties use the same set of rules. A cold war cannot be won by kindness.

Of course, the administration of our export control program is under a chairman of the Committee on Export Policy, Dr. Jack Behrman, a learned professor and author and a longtime free trade exponent, who, I am told, favors letting all bars down on trade with the Communists except on actual military weapons and the like. His argument is that Russia will make herself self-sufficient if we restrict goods she needs. I disagree. I think restrictions will hamper Soviet progress and throw the Communist economy off balance. But my point is that an administrator should believe in the policy set by Congress. His decisions otherwise could be contrary to the spirit of the law. Don't get me wrong. I am not inferring anyone is soft on the Soviets, I want to make that clear. I say some persons are soft of heart and other persons are soft in the head. We can't afford either.

Actually, when I review the commodities which have gone under export license behind the Iron Curtain and especially the industrial materials to Poland and Yugoslavia, I reach the conclusion that the United States is going a long way toward helping Khrushchev bury us. It seems sometimes that we are doing the digging, while Mr. Khrushchev looks on with a not entirely inscrutable smile.

After reading much testimony and reviewing many records, I have come to the firm conviction that a total embargo would be better in the interests of national security. Is there any doubt as to whether Tito or Gomulka hold us in any honest affection? I think not and I believe our policy of practically open trade with a so-called friendly Communist country is hurting us and helping it. No real consideration seems to have been given, in issuing export licenses, to the overall effect of building up the Communist economy and thereby we have been contributing to the success of our enemy in his economic offensive.

If the term "peaceful coexistence" had any meaning, such a policy might make sense, but the "peaceful coexistence" of Mr. Khrushchev to my mind is one of enslavement as we understand the term.

We blow hot and we blow cold. Our policy has been to use export controls on a sort of day-to-day basis of negotiation.

Congress, I hope, supported by public opinion, will be tightening the program of controls. I believe agricultural commodities such as grain and the like should be declared to be strategic.

Lenin has been quoted as saying: "As soon as they (i.e., the Western nations) start trading with us, they will prepare their own ruin." Many of his prophecies have come true. Do we want to help his batting average?

I have looked over lists of commodities for which licenses have been issued. How some of these items were deemed nonstrategic, I will never know, but when the House Committee on Export Controls sought to evaluate these lists, the Commerce Department flatly refused permission for the committee or its staff to review its pertinent files, claiming Executive privilege. The committee's efforts were thwarted but I am sure that when the final congressional report is issued it will conclude that the Government has followed a soft policy and used poor judgment in issuing export permits. For example, I asked Secretary Rusk what would happen to

the output of the steel mill we helped finance in Poland. He readily admitted its production would be strategic and that the output might well go to the Soviet Union.

And how about the Polish loan to Cuba—the proceeds of which were to be used to build a shipyard and battery repair facility? Who believes such is not to provide a base for Soviet submarines? Under the provisions of the Battle Act, I cannot understand how the President can determine that continued aid to Poland is essential to our national security. But that is the only legal basis of continued aid to Poland.

Some of our allies persist in selling planes, electronic equipment, and other items to those who are our adversaries. Such an example is the 6 Vickers Viscounts the British sold to Red China a short time ago. Where will the Chinese Reds use these planes—in peaceful pursuits? Not on your life. They will use them in transporting military equipment and men to Laos and South Vietnam, and other brush-fire areas of their making.

To me this is no matter for a pained expression of regret to our British cousins. I think we could use some firmness and brinkmanship with our own friends.

Could we persuade our allies to go along on a tough policy? I don't know. But if we passed a law to cut out all aid of every nature to noncooperating nations we might be surprised. That is, of course, if we set them an example. We cannot sell jet fighter planes to Yugoslavia and expect England to refrain.

As to why we have not been tougher, there are reports that a preinaugural Presidential task force, headed by the present Under Secretary of State, George W. Ball, recommended a virtual scrapping of the existing embargo on exports of strategic materials to Communist bloc nations. Secretary Ball has declined to inform the House committee studying exports about the report, but he is the State Department official in charge of economic affairs and that aspect of the cold war.

President Kennedy a year ago called on each citizen to ask what he could do for his Government.

One of my constituents decided what he could do. He sacrificed profit and refused to sell an electronic lumber sorter to be included in a new modern lumber mill a Canadian firm was planning to sell to Russia. Patriotism and sacrifice such as that are what this Nation needs. This man's conscience told him the sale was wrong—although the State Department had approved the transaction. That lumber mill would set the Soviet system of lumber production ahead 20 years. Such trade steps up her military-industrial potential.

I cannot feel this is any time to scrap export controls. On the contrary, we should bring all the influence and leadership at our command to persuade the free world to join us and make these controls more effective. Strangely enough, it is the NATO countries who are joined with the United States in a Treaty of Mutual Protection, yet these very nations have contributed substantially toward the strength, technological progress and military capability of their potential aggressor. Soviet bloc imports in 1960 totaled \$4.5 billion; \$2.8 billion of this was from Western Europe. Only about \$200 million was from us.

As Senator WILEY said in the Senate the other day, the Soviet Union is now scouring Western Europe in attempts to buy packaged complete plants for industry. Why? This is necessary, largely because the Soviet economy is oriented, to such a large degree, toward the output of military equipment that it lacks the capability for adequate creative technological advancement.

By attempting to buy up complete plants from the West, the Soviet Union, then, accomplishes the following purposes: First, the

Red economy may continue to concentrate upon production of scientific-industrial equipment of military value; second, the Reds are saved the great, and sometimes long, trial-and-error experimental periods for developing technological advancements; and, third, the attainment of complete production plants enables them to move forward faster than otherwise could be done under the Soviet economy.

The Senator said there are no signs on the horizon of abdication of Red goals of world conquest and burying non-Communist ideologies and systems.

Consequently, he said, it is absolutely essential that the United States encourage its allies to take a new, careful, cautious look at offers from the Communist countries and to cut off materials which would strengthen the ability of the Soviet Union to commit aggression, and I agree.

Finally, consider the sadly absurd situation of Cuba on which we have just imposed an embargo. Yet Punta del Este failed to include trade curbs and Cuba is not treated as a Communist bloc country by Cocom. The United States has announced a campaign to discourage strategic trade with Cuba, but our allies may expect an increase in their commercial exports resulting from our embargo. Canada, as a matter of fact, has announced she will continue this trade.

On the heels of all U.S. foreign aid from the Marshall plan down to the present the United States seems to be a victim of policy such as described by a onetime British statesman when he said: "There can be no permanent friends—only permanent interests." Somehow, one gets the idea that nations make profits and prosperity—rather than national security—their permanent interests and overlook friendship entirely.

Finally, as to the case of trading with the Communist bloc, I myself conclude that any trade is aid—aid toward the economic or military undoing of the free world.

I cannot see why the Kennedy administration has not finally discovered that the lifting of bans on food shipments and other commodities and following a general policy of being kind to Khrushchev is not a mistake. As Theodore C. Achilles, Special Assistant to the Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs, said in a recent speech to the Stanford University Foreign Policy Institute: "Today," he said, "policies of military containment and negative anticommunism are no longer enough. It is not enough merely to be against something or to react. We must act \* \* \*." I agree—but his boss does not seem to agree. We don't act.

To me, the way to ultimate victory is a positive program to persuade our allies to ban all strategic trade with the Sino-Soviet bloc, including Yugoslavia, Poland, and Cuba. As for ourselves, I would harden our export policy and likewise let it be firmly known to neutrals and friendly nations alike that all aid to them will stop unless and until these nations firm up their policies in harmony with ours.

The Select Committee on Export Controls of the House of Representatives will shortly be submitting a complete report to the Congress.

Meanwhile, its chairman, Mr. KITCHIN, made a statement giving his opinion as follows:

"First. The economic phase of this prolonged, tense cold war is becoming more important each day. As our military posture and that of the Soviet bloc approach a stalemate, due to the absolute destructive power of each to annihilate civilization in a nuclear military conflict, the economic phase attains the status of a prime and strategic operation.

"Second. Continued emphasis must be placed on the vital area of trade with the Sino-Soviet bloc. The cooperation of our Western allies is of paramount importance.

"Third. There must be a readjustment of our thinking as regards our present status quo attitude. It is imperative that we acquire a realistic appreciation that while we are maintaining the peace we may be losing the cold war.

"Fourth. A strong and affirmative policy on foods and fibers to the bloc must encompass a philosophy of peace for food as well as food for peace."

George Washington once expressed confidence the American people would always do the right thing if they had the facts.

Our export policy is not favorable to an informed opinion.

The Government has shrouded much of the export control policy in secrecy.

The people are unaware to a great extent of the functioning of the Cocom program and only occasionally when word leaks out of transactions such as the sale by England to Red China of planes, do they learn of its ineffectiveness.

Some matters involving security, of course, cannot be published, but secrecy is greatly overdone. The privilege is often used to cover up mistakes and to try and avoid embarrassment over error and weak decisions of both ourselves and our allies.

This attitude prevents mobilization of public opinion against continuing policy failure and ineffective administration.

What we need, it seems to me, is full and frank disclosure of the facts. The people should have the truth. If they had it, I am sure there would be a stiffening of policy and a demand for stern measures by the entire free world.

Let the peoples under the yoke of communism earn anew their freedom by hunger, hardship, and harsh sacrifice. Let the peoples under the threat of communism do the same.

On the later score, it was gratifying to read (in Saturday's New York Times) that some Americans are willing to sacrifice. A 500-member union local—Lodge 893, International Association of Machinists, Stratos Division of Fairchild Engine & Airplane Co.—invited their own loss of jobs by protesting the production of a strategic item for the Communists. Their leaders said they were shocked and dismayed to discover in their trip to Washington, D.C., that this administration has no set policy governing the export of equipment. How true.

Unless the United States sets an overriding goal and actually comes to grips with communism, unless the United States reverses its policies of compassion, appeasement, compromise, and slow retreat, I predict we will never achieve ultimate victory; and one day America will wake up and discover the free world and our allies and our economy are no longer free. Then it will be too late.

## Washington's Farewell Address

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. FRANK T. BOW**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1962

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I have listened today with great interest to the gentleman from Indiana read Washington's Farewell Address. We who are regarded as conservatives have enjoyed a great speech. I only hope a part of it rubs off on our liberal brethren and the administration.